

The  
American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION AT ANN ARBOR

WHEN the American Historical Association held its sixteenth annual meeting at Detroit, during three days at the end of December, 1900, the middle day of the three was spent in Ann Arbor, on invitation from the University of Michigan. Hospitable as were the desires of that university, and capital as was the part which its historical teachers took in the work of making the meeting a success, it was recognized that Ann Arbor had not suitable accommodations, such as were afforded by the hotel in Detroit, for the entertainment of an historical convention of two or three hundred members. But the apparatus of human life has grown greatly in these twenty-five years, and in few regions more than in southeastern Michigan. Ann Arbor, which had some 14,000 inhabitants in 1900, now has some 22,000. The University of Michigan, which then had a little over 3000 students, now has 9000. Its buildings, which when the Association first saw them were the usual "fortuitous concourse" of ugly units that in old times marked the typical American campus—unrelated specimens of every variety of architecture but the good—are now an imposing and concordant array of handsome structures, entirely capable of receiving such a gathering and giving its members hospitable entertainment and pleasure. Foremost among them for such purposes was the far-famed Michigan Union; foremost for beauty the magnificent Lawyers' Club, whose great dining-hall is not surpassed by any at Oxford or Cambridge; foremost in professional attractions for the student of history the wonderful William L. Clements Library. The Union provided halls for most of the meetings, rooms for many attending members, restaurants, and lobbies for social conference. A reception in the Clements Library on the first afternoon, a smoker in the Union on the second evening, and a luncheon at noon of the third day marked the hospitality of the University to the Association and its allied or-

ganizations. Speeches, wise or witty or both, were made at the luncheon by Professor Dixon R. Fox, of Columbia University, by Professor Peter Guilday, of the Catholic University of America, secretary of the American Catholic Historical Association, and by the president of the American Historical Association, Professor Charles M. Andrews, of Yale University. For all the arrangements thoughtfully and skillfully made for the entertainment and comfort of the visiting members, it is proper to record here their great indebtedness to the chairman of the Committee of Local Arrangements, Professor William A. Frayer, to its secretary, Professor Preston W. Slosson, and to their colleagues of the historical department of the university.

At the time of the Detroit-Ann Arbor meeting of 1900 there were 1626 members of the American Historical Association; the number reported at the recent meeting was 2962. That meeting was attended by two or three hundred of the members; at the meeting of December, 1925, the registration was 460, an exceptionally high number, surpassed on only a few preceding occasions of meeting—and they came from forty-one states and Canada. This is not the place to enlarge upon the imponderable gains of the last quarter-century, or those which can not be expressed in numbers, but they have certainly been such as to gratify all who have the interests of the society at heart.

The allied organizations which have been alluded to were the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the Agricultural History Society, which according to their custom held their meetings at the same time and place, the American Catholic Historical Association, which often follows this practice, the Bibliographical Society of America, and the new History of Science Society. Of the first two, each had a joint meeting with the parent society and a special dinner. At the dinner of the agricultural group Professor William L. Westermann, of Columbia University, read a paper on Ancient Egyptian Agriculture as revealed in the Papyri. The Bibliographical Society, meeting appropriately in the Clements Library, heard reports on union lists of periodicals, on the completion of Sabin's *Dictionary of Books relating to America*, on the *Guide to Historical Literature* which is being prepared by a committee of the American Historical Association under the chairmanship of Professor George M. Dutcher, of Wesleyan University, and on other bibliographical enterprises, and an entertaining paper by Professor Randolph G. Adams, librarian of the Clements Library, *Some Thoughts on Historians' Relationship to a Library of Rare Books*.

The programme of the American Catholic Historical Association was given by experiment an unusual form, which however seems to have worked out to a very gratifying success. The seventeen papers on the programme had a unified purpose, and lay all in the same field, that of the history of Catholic historiography. Each of them was devoted to the life, characteristics, and work of an individual Catholic historical writer—Eusebius, Augustine, Orosius, Gregory of Tours, Bede, Ordericus Vitalis, Baronius and Bollandus, Mabillon and Muratori, Lingard, Janssen, Denifle, Pastor, and others. There was no presidential address, the president of the society, Professor Henry Jones Ford, having died in August. A special topic for practical consideration at one of the conferences of the society was the making of a guide to the printed materials for American Catholic history. Professor Parker T. Moon, of Columbia University, was elected president of the society for the ensuing year, Dr. Peter Guilday re-elected secretary.

Before the History of Science Society, Dr. John K. Wright, of the American Geographical Society, made a Plea for the History of Geography; Mr. Edwin W. Schreiber, of Chicago, gave an account of Some Phases of the History of the Metric System; Professor Florian Cajori, of the University of California, presented an Historical View of the Educational Value of Mathematics; and Professor Louis C. Karpinski, of the University of Michigan, read a paper on the First Text-Book in America.

Among the many merits of the programme of the American Historical Association, framed by a committee of which Professor William E. Dodd, of the University of Chicago, was chairman, a high rank would be accorded to the large place which was given to the younger members of the Association. The younger members being, however, too modest to stray outside the fields which they have securely made their own, the effect was that much of the programme was devoted to subjects of limited range. In consequence of this, there could be little real discussion of the papers, few auditors having the temerity to dissent publicly from the views of one who has apparently made himself master of a small, or perhaps obscure, portion of history. But the absence of lively discussion from our annual meetings is an old story, and has been already dwelt upon, perhaps to satiety, by one who is now presenting his twenty-fourth of these annual chronicles.

Another theme of annual lamentation is the excessive length or copiousness of the programme. Can it not be simplified? Sixty-odd papers or addresses was too many last year; it was too many

this year. The programme of 1900 contained seventeen papers yet was, if memory can be trusted, quite as enjoyable and nearly as instructive. But perhaps it is only the man who attempts to report such a meeting who is bewildered by its kaleidoscopic variety, and the only criticism of the programme which was known to be expressed with any warmth concerned the late day on which it was mailed to the members from Ann Arbor. This we may dwell upon without offense, because it was uncertain where the fault lay; it certainly inconvenienced many members in making their arrangements, especially those who could come for but part of the meeting, and probably kept not a few members from coming at all. The Executive Council instructed the committee appointed to make the programme for the next annual meeting that its text should be in the hands of the assistant secretary before November 1, and should be printed by her and sent out from Washington.

According to custom, there was a general session on the first evening, that of December 29, at which, in the absence of the president of the university, an address of welcome was given by Mr. William L. Clements, a member of the Board of Regents, and the president of the Association, Professor Charles M. Andrews, read his presidential address. Mr. Clements announced two accessions of the highest importance to the manuscript section of the Clements Library, namely, the Clinton Papers and the papers of General Nathanael Greene. The Clinton collection includes the papers of Admiral George Clinton, governor of New York 1741-1753, of General Sir Henry Clinton, British commander-in-chief in America, papers many hundreds in number, and of his son. The papers of General Greene, numbering some thousands and bound in twenty-two volumes, embrace some eight hundred of his own letters. Both collections are of the very highest importance for the history of the Revolutionary War, especially of its later years.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Andrews's presidential address, entitled, "The American Revolution: an Interpretation", was published in the January number of this journal.<sup>2</sup>

The general session held on the second evening was devoted to the Problems of the Far East. Three papers were read: one by Harold S. Quigley, professor of political science in the University of Minnesota, on Extra-territoriality in China; one by Professor Paul H. Clyde, of the Ohio State University, on the course of Japan with respect to the Open Door policy or doctrine in Manchuria in

<sup>1</sup> A fuller description of the two collections is printed in the *Michigan Alumnus* for January.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 219-232.



the period from 1905 to 1907, during which the Russian and Japanese armies were being withdrawn from Manchuria after the Russo-Japanese War; and one by Mr. William Boyd Carpenter, of Washington, on the position and duties of the United States in the Orient. Mr. Clyde's paper was history, the other two were not; but, as has been said before in these pages, the group in the Association devoted to the affairs of the Far East tends always to fill its programme with discourses on present-day politics rather than with Far Eastern history, the number of students in the United States interested in the former being really much larger than that of those interested in the latter. Somewhat the same has often been true of the sessions which by intention were devoted to Latin-American history. Mr. Clyde maintained that, in the years in question, Japan observed in Manchuria the principle of the Open Door as defined by Secretary Hay's note of November 13, 1899, comprising non-interference with treaty ports, equitable administration of the Chinese treaty tariff, and avoidance of discrimination in the matter of railway charges and harbor dues; and he held that no broader interpretation of the doctrine was justified until it was re-defined at the Washington Conference.

A third general session had been planned for the last evening of the convention, but circumstances required one of the two speakers to leave the meeting before that time, and the session was abandoned, place being found elsewhere for the other address, that of Professor Nathaniel W. Stephenson, on "John C. Calhoun, 1812 and After", which we shall have the pleasure of printing in a later issue.

One other occasion of general meeting remains to be spoken of, and one of the most important. In view of the effort which the Association had undertaken, to raise its endowment from the present sum of about \$50,000 to \$500,000 (by later deliberations, however, the amount to be sought for has been raised to a million), it was arranged that the general luncheon of the second day of the convention should take the form of a conference on the Responsibilities and Resources of the Association. It was given especial distinction by a brilliant address from Professor Guy S. Ford, of the University of Minnesota, on the purpose and future of the society, in which he directed attention to the new forms which historical research is taking on and must increasingly take on in the future, by reason of the advances made by other sciences and the complex demands which such advances in economic, social, and psychological knowledge make upon the historian. Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger, of Harvard University, enlarged upon the opportunities for histori-

cal research now open to American students, and made helpful suggestions as to the use of those opportunities. Hon. Albert J. Beveridge, formerly senator from Indiana, expressing himself with much warmth of appreciation concerning the present and future importance of the Association, spoke with much force and eloquence upon Historical Research as a Public Interest, and the strong claim which such a society has for larger means.

Upon these speeches followed a report of progress in the campaign for endowment, by Professor Evarts B. Greene, of Columbia University, who at the meeting a year before had been appointed chairman of the committee on the subject. The increase of endowment, it should be again explained, is intended, first, to provide more adequate and steady support for the varied kinds of work which the Association already has in hand; and, secondly, to enable it to assume a more pronounced and much-needed leadership in the promotion of historical research and publication. Among the steps of progress reported, from a year necessarily devoted mainly to planning and preliminaries, one of the most interesting, and one of the most encouraging as to the hold which the Association has on the most thoughtful minds, was the formation of a National Advisory Committee. Their names will serve as guaranties to the public that the effort in which the Association is engaged commends itself to a remarkable group of national leaders—the Vice-President, Mr. Root, Mr. Hughes, Secretary Hoover, Senators Bayard and Glass and Cummins and Deneen and Beveridge and John Sharp Williams, Governors Lowden and Montague, Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. Dwight W. Morrow, and many such. The progress of the campaign will be fully chronicled from time to time in the pages of this journal devoted to "Historical News", of which no part should be more interesting to members than this. Meantime, it is to be mentioned with regret that Professor Greene, who has expended unwearied labor and many hours in doing the preliminary parts of the work and smoothing its pathway toward success, found it necessary to resign the chairmanship of the committee. The earlier resignation of Professor Henry M. Wriston from the position of executive secretary of the committee, on his election to the presidency of Lawrence College, was mentioned at the time of its occurrence. At the Ann Arbor meeting a reorganization of the committee, made necessary by these resignations, was effected by the appointment of Mr. Beveridge as chairman and the engagement of Professor Solon J. Buck, of the University of Minnesota and the Minnesota Historical Society, to serve as executive secretary in New York from the

beginning of February till September, giving his whole time to the work, with the aid of an executive subcommittee mostly resident in that city. Professor Greene has consented to be vice-chairman of the committee.

The semi-autonomous annual conference of historical societies, held on the third morning of the sessions, was devoted to the question, How may the work of collection and publication as carried on by historical societies be made more effective for the purpose of general history? Professor Arthur C. Cole, of the Ohio State University, discussed this question in its relation to the general social history of the United States, Professor Frederic L. Paxson, of the University of Wisconsin, in its relation to recent and future history, and there was extended discussion by others; but a full record of the proceedings will be presented in the annual pamphlet report which the efficient secretary of the conference, Dr. Joseph Schafer, succeeds in bringing out so much more promptly than the slow-grinding mills of the Government Printing Office bring out the annual reports of the Association.

Another practical conference was that on Opportunities for Research in the Colleges, meaning especially those colleges remote from universities and large libraries. In this session, arranged for by the chairman of the Association's committee on the subject, Professor William K. Boyd, of Duke University, there was informal discussion by Professors James O. Knauss, of the Florida State College, Herbert C. Bell, of Bowdoin College, and Caroline Sparrow, of Sweet Briar College, and by others.

When the annual meeting of such an association is the fortieth, and when so large a proportion of the total membership attends each year, it may be taken for granted, without rhetorical or complimentary amplification, that the proceedings of an annual meeting—papers, practical conferences, luncheons and dinners and social contacts and conversations—are profitable to the profession and edifying and pleasing to its individual members. But if one is dispensed from the necessity of describing these general effects, apparently one can not be dispensed from that of giving some account of the contents of the papers read, even though there remain forty-one of them—twenty-one in the history of the Old World, twenty in the history of America—that have not yet been mentioned. The sessions in which they were grouped, with a laudable effort, more definite than has been usual, to bring together closely related papers, were entitled as for ancient history, medieval history, personalities of Tudor-Stuart England (no session seems to have aroused more interest than this),

the Revolution and the Restoration in France, American colonial history, Union problems of the Civil War (Confederate problems, it will be remembered, were considered at Richmond the year before), Canadian-American relations, Latin-American relations, chiefly of the times of the Panama Congress, a hundred years ago, and the joint sessions with other societies on the history of the Mississippi Valley and on agricultural history. But it seems convenient, disregarding somewhat these groupings, to deal with the papers in an order more nearly chronological.

In the session held jointly with the Agricultural History Society, Professor Albert T. Olmstead, of the University of Illinois, read a paper on Land Tenure in the Ancient Orient, embracing a great variety of tenures, freehold, servile, feudal, in Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Palestine, and Persia. This essay we shall be privileged to print in a later number. At the annual dinner of the same society, Professor William L. Westermann, of Columbia University, out of such knowledge of ancient Egyptian agriculture as can be derived from the papyri, especially from the document-files of Zenon, gave an account of the condition of agricultural and other labor under Ptolemy Philadelphus. Absolute as the economic organization of the Ptolemaic state appeared to be, the extent of governmental coercion in the third century B.C. was limited by the pressure upon Greek capital and by the heavy demand for labor. The rapid economic expansion then going on in Egypt gave labor at this time a greater freedom of movement than it had later; it was even possible to "strike". Wages could be illustrated by such data as that a common sailor on a Nile boat received seven and a half drachmas (or seven and a half bushels of wheat) a month, a common farm laborer five drachmas, or five bushels.

While we are speaking of papyri, it should be mentioned that, in the ancient history section, Professor Boak, of the University of Michigan, made a report on the excavations carried on in Egypt by that university; he had also arranged in one of the rooms of the university library an exhibition of papyri, and in another room an archaeological exhibit.

The history of the Eastern Empire is a field almost untouched hitherto in all the proceedings of the Association. Doubly valued therefore was the paper read by Professor A. A. Vasiliev, formerly of Petrograd, but teaching this year in the University of Wisconsin, on Byzantine Studies in Russia, Past and Present. Adverting briefly to the work of certain German scholars at St. Petersburg at the beginning of the nineteenth century, he proceeded to describe

that of V. Vasilievski (d. 1899), professor in the University of St. Petersburg and member of the Academy of Sciences, the real founder of the systematic study of Byzantine history in Russia, that of Nikodem Kondakov (d. 1925) in the field of Byzantine archaeology and art, and that of Th. Uspenski, sole director of the Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople from its foundation in 1894 till its suspension. The activity of the Russian theological schools in this field of studies was also described. Since the World War and the Revolution, the former Archaeological Commission, enlarged and transformed in 1918 into the Academy for the History of Material Culture, has become one of the chief centres of Byzantine studies in Russia. Of late it has been paying special attention to the historical and archaeological investigation of the medieval Crimea. Byzantine studies are now mostly centred at Leningrad. Professor Vasiliev spoke also of the work of the Russian Museum (formerly the Museum of Alexander III.) and that of the Constantine Porphyrogenetos Commission.

An interesting episode in Milanese history of the eleventh century was recounted by Professor Sidney M. Brown, of Lehigh University, in a paper on Arialdus and the Pataria. Its main intent was to show the part which Arialdus had in shaping the Pataria, in giving to a political group hitherto vague the definite character of a party of reform and of resistance to the local Milanese clergy, so coherent and substantial as to receive powerful encouragement from reforming pontiffs at Rome, of the Hildebrandine connection. Mr. Brown believed the Edict on Investitures, of 1075, to have been only local in application, not to become of general intent till 1080.

Next, Professor James W. Thompson, of the University of Chicago, discussed German Sectionalism and Political Cleavage during the War of Investiture, disentangling the complexities which arose from the conjoining of three distinguishable struggles—between Henry IV. and his revolted vassals, between the emperor and the rebellious peasantry, and between the emperor and Gregory VII. and the papal partizans. He revealed such facts as that the German bishops in general were faithful to Henry IV., that most of the Benedictine houses sided with him, while Hirschau and its Cluniac associates were passionate partizans of the pope, that the parish priests in most of Germany except Saxony sympathized with the imperial cause, that it had the steady support of the burghers of the Rhine cities, that the region most constantly favorable to the Salian house was naturally Franconia, that all classes in Saxony and the upper feudality in Swabia were against the emperor, but that he

managed to maintain his hold on Bavaria and Carinthia. Professor Thompson pursued the history of the war to the election of Conrad III. in 1139, and analyzed its large effects upon the subsequent history of Germany.

The essay of Professor Carl Stephenson, of the University of Wisconsin, on the Origins of English Boroughs, will appear in full in some later issue of this journal. It was an attempt to apply to the case of England those doctrines of Professor Henri Pirenne, on the origins of medieval municipalities, which he has most recently expressed in his volume of Princeton lectures, *Medieval Cities*.

Much light was cast on study in the University of Paris in the thirteenth century, especially on the system of examinations, by Miss Dorothy L. Mackay, of Mills College, in a paper based on the *De Conscientia* of Robert de Sorbon, a sermon on the Last Judgment, consisting largely of comparisons between the applicant for admission to Heaven and the student seeking the *licentia docendi*. Taken in connection with the regulations that may be found in Denifle's *Chartularium*, it affords illuminating pictures of the student in his preparation for examination, in his attitude toward his examiners, and occasionally in his efforts to escape examination or failure by means of external influence or pressure.

For a study of Changes in the Agricultural Methods of an English Village after 1208, Professor N. S. B. Gras, of the University of Minnesota, chose a village in southern England of which the manorial accounts are nearly complete from that date till into the eighteenth century (though in this paper only the period 1208-1448 was considered). The number of acres tilled and the number of sheep kept were much diminished, while by reason of improvements in technique made by the lord the net yield of wheat rose steadily. Commutation of labor, whereby tenants could engage in commercial agriculture, paying money rents, buying their supplies, and selling their products, came to them not by reason of improvements in technique but simply because of the growth of towns, and the alternative of flight to them in preference to the holding of land on the old condition of praedial services. The commutation of week works came early, while many seasonal services, heavy in amount, lasted down to modern times.

No session, as we have said, seems to have awakened more interest on the part of the auditors than that to which the general title, Personalities of Tudor-Stuart England, was given in the programme. Here four papers were presented: on Good Queen Bess, by Dr. Conyers Read, of Philadelphia, formerly professor in the University



of Chicago; on Essex, the favorite of that queen, by Professor Edward P. Cheyney, of the University of Pennsylvania; on Political Portraits of the Seventeenth Century, by Mr. Godfrey Davies, now of the University of Chicago; and on James II., by Professor Robert H. George, of Brown University. We expect to give our readers the pleasure of reading Dr. Read's contribution to this session. Professor Cheyney chose to use his paper on Essex as a test of the question whether the historian, by exclusion of all racial, party, or religious sympathies or predilections, all effort to draw any moral or philosophical lesson from his subject, all effort toward eloquence in presentation, can achieve a result that will win as general acceptance from fellow-historians as the results of observation by scientists win from their fellows. If all trained historians have access to the same contemporary testimony and all apply to it the same rigorous methods, they should all reach the same results, and this would be historical truth so far as that can be reached. In the effort to reach this end in the particular case Professor Cheyney described the contemporary popularity of Essex and the emotional temperament that seemed to explain this popularity, gave instances to show his mental strength and weakness, stated his religious position, and gave an estimate of his military achievements. The dominating influence on his career was found in the fact that he was the queen's favorite. This gave him a position, called for capacities, limited achievements, and diverted energies into directions unsuited to his nature. The queen's poor judgment, obstinacy, and injection of her personal feelings into the realm of public life brought about the relative failure of his career and his sad end.

Mr. George's view of the character and conduct of James II. was that the obstinate resolution which all historians have remarked in him was bottomed on fear, that he felt always on the defensive, but that, as fear begat resolution, resolution in turn begat excessive confidence in the measures taken to guard against the dangers apprehended. Lack of quick perception and of statesmanlike breadth of view contributed their part in making him weak in crises despite resolute intentions and personal courage.

A slightly later portion of English history was considered by Professor William T. Morgan, of Indiana University, in a paper on the Colonial Aspects of the Negotiation of the Treaty of Utrecht. Colonial interests had played a dominant part in the organization of the South Sea Company and the Canadian expedition; he showed the highly important part they had in the overtures for peace inaugurated by the Tories through the Abbé Gaultier, and in the op-



position of the French, the Dutch, and the English Whigs to the negotiations themselves as they developed thereafter. In the preliminaries, in which Great Britain had demanded St. Kitts, Newfoundland, Hudson's Bay, the *asiento* for ten years, and four treaty ports—two in the South Sea and two in the Atlantic—the French granted the *asiento* for thirty years and the British gave up the treaty ports, while the questions regarding Newfoundland and Acadia were left to be settled at the general conference at Utrecht. There, after strong Dutch and Imperial pressure, England agreed to yield to France certain fishing rights off Newfoundland and to cede Cape Breton Island.

Of the four contributions to the history of France in the periods of the Revolution and the Restoration, the first, that of Mr. De-Forest Van Slyck, of Yale University, under the broad title, *The Revolution in the Making*, treated of a group of organizations of the days before the Revolution which have been called *sociétés de pensée*, and of their function in translating the philosophy of the eighteenth century into an active agent in politics. Towards the close of the reign of Louis XV. that philosophy had become incorporated in a complex of heterogeneous societies, secret and semi-secret, held together by an elaborate system of affiliation and correspondence. After 1782 many of these societies took on a political and revolutionary tone; new societies, devoted ostensibly to non-political ends but harboring concealed revolutionary intents, entered the field, and clubs actually political began to emerge. A study of their minutes and of the correspondence of their members shows that they were merely *sociétés de pensée* in a further stage of development, and carried over into the political field, especially in the troubled years from 1787 to 1789, the peculiar characteristics of the purely intellectual reunions, from whose forms and proceedings there seems to be an evolution into those of the Jacobin organization of 1793.

Upon this followed a paper by Professor Fred M. Fling, of the University of Nebraska, on the States General of 1789, emphasizing the belief that the Revolution was saved in July, 1789, by the keen political sense of the common man, the "man in the street" in Paris, and his vigorous initiative in meeting force with force. Mr. Leo Gershoy, of the University of Rochester, spoke on the Legend of Barère, endeavoring to show the historical growth of the belief in his iniquity, inconstancy, and cowardice, to estimate the factors that contributed to its growth till it became a commonplace in the early histories of the Revolution, to show the existence of evidence which was ignored in the formation of the tradition, and to pave the way toward a juster view of his personality and career.

Coming to a later period of French history, a paper was presented by Mr. Frederick B. Artz, of Oberlin College, on the Electoral System of France under the Restoration. He concerned himself, not with the anatomy of the system provided by the Charte and the ensuing laws, but with the manner in which it worked. He showed how the influence of the government was exercised, first, through the prefects, in the drawing up of the lists of those entitled to vote. Out of a population of nearly 32,000,000 there were, even in 1829, only 88,275 voters, of whom 10,000 were in the department of the Seine and only thirty in that of Corsica. A number between a third and a half of the electors abstained from voting. There was almost no campaigning. In practice the elections, in so far as they were not controlled by the government, were in the hands of the rich bourgeoisie.

The last of the papers in European history which we have to chronicle is that of Professor Robert J. Kerner, of the University of Missouri, on Recent Changes in Russian Land Tenure, read in the joint session held with the Agricultural History Society. As a result of Stolypin's land reforms of 1906-1911, some 47 per cent. of the peasant households cultivating their lands under the communal land tenure of the *mir* had by the first of January, 1916, petitioned for land regulation, a step toward private property. The instinct for private property had sunk deep into the peasant mind just before the Revolution. The Revolution of 1917 was characterized by a vast elemental agrarian movement based on land hunger. It culminated in the seizure of an area equal to 169,000 square miles belonging hitherto to landlords, rich peasants, churches, and monasteries, making an increase of one-fifth in the average acreage per individual on peasant farms. Under the New Economic Policy inaugurated in 1921, the Agrarian Code of 1922, while maintaining the abolition of private ownership in land, authorized a permanent, hereditary leasehold of various types, in which communal land tenure vastly predominated.

The Agricultural History Society also elicited, from Professor Kan-Ichi Asakawa, of Yale University, an interesting paper entitled, Some Phases of the Relationship between Agricultural and Social and Political Institutions in Japanese History. Mountainous country and restricted area available for cultivation, the necessity, for rice cultivation, of terraced level fields, and of careful manipulation of small tools, the absence of animal husbandry and needlessness of pasture and meadow, have combined to make the system of small farms the prevalent one in all periods, and to develop early the

individual control of rice-land. The social unit of the rural life of Japan was always the *mura* or hamlet of neighboring families, possessing land in severalty, with no inducement such as common herds or common plans of irrigation to produce community life. The introduction from China, in the seventh century, of state ownership of land did not have permanent effect. Under the medieval system of the *shō* (manor) and under the feudal system which grew out of it, individual control of rice-lands continued in essentials. Therefore when the feudal régime fell in 1868 the peasantry were well trained in rural self-government and in the possession of rice-lands in plots of similar size, and the new government had no difficulty in installing the system of full peasant ownership.

Among the contributions to American history, four dealt with topics in the colonial period. That of Mr. Leonard W. Larabee, of Yale University, concerned the Appointment and Installation of the Royal Governor. The method of appointing, the influences involved in securing the position, the procedure incident to departure—preparation of commissions and instructions, payment of fees, receipt of perquisites, taking of the oaths of office, etc.—and the ceremonies of installation in the province, were all described, and emphasis was laid on the need for studying the governor's previous history, as a means toward understanding his personality.

Among the striking conditions of constitutional history in eighteenth-century America, one, certainly, is the growth of the pretensions of the assemblies in the matter of parliamentary privilege, and another, the wide-spread uniformity of the privileges claimed. These phenomena were discussed by Miss Mary P. Clarke, of Beaver College, in a careful study. Except in New England, the speaker of the assembly, on being presented to the governor of the colony, asked in the name of the house for privileges essentially the same as those of the House of Commons. Many men were punished by fine, imprisonment, or otherwise, for breaches of privilege. The house judged of its own elections, disciplined members, at times expelled them, and even refused to admit them after re-election. Sharp conflicts occurred between the houses and the courts. Miss Clarke adduced also instances in which the council upheld the lower house in its claims, and in which governors yielded to them.

The paper of Miss Ruth L. Higgins, assistant professor in Earlham College, was occupied with the Expansion of New York during the Eighteenth Century. Except for the small community at Schenectady, settlement at the beginning of that century was confined to the Hudson valley. Miss Higgins described the advance

into the Schoharie valley from Schenectady and from the Hudson, the extension along the Mohawk due to the building of Fort Hunter in 1712, the advance a few years later to Herkimer and German Flats, the effects of the building of Fort Oswego, the settlement upon the upper waters of the Susquehanna in the vicinity of Cherry Valley after 1738, the advance northward toward Lake George and Lake Champlain after the treaty of 1763, the filling up of the lands east of the Fort Stanwix treaty line of 1768, and, after the Revolution, the effects of the treaties with the Iroquois for the lands east of Lake Seneca, the operations of Massachusetts west of it, the opening up of the Phelps and Gorham purchase, and the Holland Land Company's extinction in 1797 of the Indian title to lands west of the Genesee.

Westward expansion in the region next south of New York was treated by Professor A. T. Volwiler, of Indiana University, in a paper on the Pennsylvania Indian Traders in the Ohio Country before 1754. Before that year, enterprising traders from Pennsylvania had pushed the frontier of their traffic to the Wabash, Maumee, and Kentucky rivers, five hundred miles beyond the English settler's frontier. The strengthening of their influence was described, the making of treaties, the threat to the French of severance of their lines of communication between Canada and Louisiana and deflection of the fur-trade to Philadelphia and New York, and the response of the French in the erection of their line of forts from Niagara to the Ohio.

While the session devoted to Latin-American history was mainly occupied, as has already been indicated, with questions relating to the Panama Congress, it had also a paper, by Professor Samuel F. Bemis, of the George Washington University, on Why Spain signed the Treaty of 1795. The exposition was based on studies in the diplomatic papers preserved in the Archivo Histórico Nacional at Madrid, and especially on examination of the minutes of the Spanish Council of State for the years from 1785 to 1796. It was shown that this surprising treaty, so fateful to the future advancement of the United States, by which a great European power, after twelve years of resolute denial of the claims put forward by a weak American republic, suddenly conceded them outright, was due solely to the complications of European diplomacy at the moment. Spain found herself in an unnatural alliance; her ally, Great Britain, was becoming as dangerous to her future as her enemy, France, was to her immediate interests. As Godoy was meditating a secret peace with France he learned of the Jay treaty, interpreted it as a move to-

ward alliance between Great Britain and the United States, and, alarmed at its possible consequences to the Spanish empire in America, hastened to make the concessions which are embodied in the treaty of San Lorenzo.

Of the studies of the Panama Congress, that of Mr. Lewis Hanke, of Columbia University, related to the Attitude of Simon Bolívar toward the Participation of the United States in that congress. No phrase in the circular of December 7, 1824, suggested that Bolívar intended to include the United States, which was finally invited by the Colombian minister Salazar. Bolívar at once protested that this would compromise Colombia with Great Britain. The invitation was not, as has sometimes been charged, a plan of Santander to thwart Bolívar, but had been under consideration by the Colombian government for some time. On May 20, 1825, Bolívar enjoined Santander that the United States was not to be asked to join the league. Later in that year his interest in the league waned, as he became involved in his wide plans for the union of a large part of South America under his autocratic leadership. Bolívar had no active enmity against the United States, but his experiences had led him to prefer the support and protection of Great Britain.

Another aspect of the history of the Panama Congress was treated by Professor Reginald F. Arragon, of Reed College, in a paper on Pan-Americanism versus Spanish-Americanism as respects that gathering. The movement toward it was essentially Spanish-American, whether in its concern with the common war of liberation, as emphasized by Colombia, in the design of Bolívar to use it for maintaining the social stability of the new states, or in Mexico's project for economic union by the exchange of exclusive commercial privileges among sister states. The friendly attitude maintained toward Great Britain despite her aversion to the doctrine of "free ships, free goods", and the jealousy manifested toward the United States, marked the Congress from the beginning as far from being truly Pan-American, and the course of its proceedings confirmed that characterization.

The third of this group of contributions, by Dr. Paul N. Garber, of Duke University, on Public Opinion in the United States and the Panama Congress, showed how the American people of a century ago expressed themselves in the press, on the platform, and in their correspondence, in regard to the first step toward Pan-Americanism. Commerce, an isthmian canal, better international relations, the future of Cuba and Porto Rico, were factors influencing the Ameri-

can people in favor of sending an American mission to the Congress. Opposition was based on the fear of entangling alliances, the slavery issue, and partizan hostility to President Adams. The action of the Senate was due to the last, not to any pressure of public opinion.

A paper read in the joint session held with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association by Miss Grace L. Nute, of the Minnesota Historical Society, on the American Fur Company's Fishing Enterprises on Lake Superior,<sup>3</sup> may not inappropriately be grouped with those which were read in the session devoted to the History of Canadian-American Relations. The phase of the company's activities described extended only from 1834, when Ramsay Crooks became president of the company on Astor's withdrawal, to 1841, the year before the company's failure. The scope of its fishing enterprise expanded until in 1839 the usual Michigan and Ohio markets could not consume the entire yield, and attempts were made throughout the entire United States to create a new market for Lake Superior fish. Its methods are of interest as illustrating American "big business" in an early example of enterprise subsidiary to the main conduct of a great corporation.

More fully Canadian in subject was the paper of Mr. Wilson P. Shortridge, of the University of West Virginia, on the Canadian-American Frontier during the Rebellion of 1837-1838.<sup>3a</sup> The American population living along the frontier at that time was composed largely of New Englanders, proud of their republican institutions, convinced that only under such institutions could political liberty be obtained, and energetically interested in reform movements of various kinds. To such minds it was easy for those leaders of the Canadian rebellion who fled across the frontier to represent that the people of Upper Canada were eager to cast off allegiance to Great Britain, and that the issues involved in the rebellion were similar to those of the American Revolution. Promises of liberal land-grants were made to men who would volunteer to aid the rebels in Upper Canada. The outcome was the formation of "Hunters' Lodges" along the frontier and the organization of expeditions for the conquest of that province. Although the Hunters formed only a very small minority of the population on the American side of the line, as the rebels did in Canada, these proved to be very troublesome minorities, and there was considerable danger of war, only averted by the sincere desire of peace on the part of the constituted authorities of both countries.

<sup>3</sup> Printed in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* for March, 1926.

<sup>3a</sup> Printed in the *Canadian Historical Review* for March.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—29.



Some of the Influences of the United States on Early Canadian Political Development were considered in a careful paper by Professor Duncan McArthur, of Queen's University. Adverting first to the modelling of early constitutions of Canadian provinces on the forms of government which had been developed in the older English colonies to the southward, he described the tendency of the United Empire Loyalists to introduce into Upper Canada forms of local government based on New England traditions, the checking of this by the British government and substitution of county government through appointed justices of the peace, the influence of the more highly developed economic system prevailing to the southward, and the manner in which Canadian-American trade, determined to follow natural conditions and to disregard the restraints of the old mercantile system on which the old empire had been constructed, opened the way to the abandonment of that system and the introduction of responsible government in Canada.

A specific episode in the history of economic approach of the two countries was detailed by Mr. George W. Brown, of the University of Toronto, in an account of the Opening of the St. Lawrence to American Shipping.<sup>3b</sup> After the opening of the Erie Canal, it was felt by British and Canadian interests that a canal system which should make the St. Lawrence navigable from the lakes to the ocean would win back the trade of the West, especially if the British system of preferences continued. Such a canal system was undertaken at heavy expense by Canada after 1840 and finished by 1849. Before its completion, however, Great Britain determined to adopt free trade, and the preferential system fell, with disastrous consequences to the St. Lawrence export trade. The repeal of the Navigation Laws by Parliament in 1849 freed the St. Lawrence from the monopoly granted to British shipping, but if Western trade was to be attracted, American vessels must be allowed to sail from the lakes by a continuous voyage to the sea. The demand for this came rather from Canada than from the States, but in the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 the river was opened temporarily, and in the Treaty of 1871 the right of such navigation was conceded forever.

Before speaking of the Civil War papers, we may advert to a paper by Miss Kathleen Bruce, of Wheaton College, on Slave Labor in the Virginia Iron Industry, in which, against the prevailing view that before the war Virginia was in economic decline, and that the factory system of manufacturing could not subsist there with slave labor, she essayed to prove that rolling mills and puddling furnaces,

<sup>3b</sup> Printed in the *Canadian Historical Review* for March, 1926.



built at Richmond only a few years after they had been established at Pittsburgh, thrived under the slave system. She based her conclusions on the records, accounts, and correspondence of the Tredegar Iron Works, and of Joseph R. Anderson, a graduate of West Point who became their agent in 1841, lessee in 1843, owner in 1848. Out of a business which in 1841 was about to collapse he made a net profit of \$47,632 in 1844 and of \$98,272 in 1846. He attributed his success to the use of the labor of slaves, mostly hired, and usually working under white bosses. It was his basic policy never to hire a negro who did not wish to be employed in his works. The negroes, working hard but considerably treated, had opportunities to prosper, and found attractions in the system.

Another contribution to the history of the ante-bellum period was the paper of Mr. Eugene H. Roseboom, of the Ohio State University, on *Some Aspects of Ohio Politics, 1850-1855*, in which he showed the intricate shiftings and changes in the party politics of the state caused in those five years by the workings of four important movements or issues—the slavery issue in its various phases, loco-focoism or radical democracy, temperance reform, and nativism or the Know-Nothing movement. The culmination of the struggles, in the election of Chase as governor in 1855, was fully described.

The papers on Union Problems in the Civil War were four in number. Professor James G. Randall, of the University of Illinois, discussed the Rule of Law under the Lincoln Administration, dwelling upon the extra-legal imprisonments, the granting of immunity to executive officers, the creating of special war courts, the invasions of the fields of civil government and of state authority by military officers, the lack of enforcement of the Habeas Corpus Act. Yet, he pointed out, civil liberties were by no means annihilated under Lincoln and no thoroughgoing dictatorship was established. Freedom of speech was in general maintained. Newspapers were seldom suspended or hampered in expression. Military trial of citizens in peaceful areas was exceptional. The administration did not seek arbitrarily to perpetuate its power or to destroy its opponents. War powers were widely extended, but those in authority were controlled by the American people's feeling for constitutional government, and the personality of Lincoln softened the effect of harsh measures.

Mr. Thomas R. Hay, of Cleveland, under the title *President Lincoln and the Army of the Potomac*, dealt rather with the underlying causes, than with the fact, of Lincoln's interference with military operations in Virginia. To this end, he set forth the condition of the United States army in 1861 as respects organization, training,

and personnel, and the political pressure brought upon Lincoln by factions and their leaders. He also contrasted the costly procedure of the Civil War—generals of political appointment successively cast aside till at last command came into the hands of professionals of demonstrated fitness—with that followed at the time of the World War, when, with few exceptions, the ranking officers who went to France in responsible command were still in command, usually in more responsible assignments, when the Armistice was signed.

English Opinion of the Civil War, until the Proclamation, was estimated and described by Mr. Henry D. Jordan, of Dartmouth College, who explained the relation of anti-slavery feeling, of opposition to protective tariffs, and of opposition to democracy, to the course of public opinion in Great Britain. Mr. Frederick A. Shannon, of the Iowa State Teachers College, analyzed the Conscription and Bounty Problem of the North during the Civil War. The problem, as Congress saw it after two years of inadequate recruiting by the states, was to pass an act which would assist the state governors in building up the army without depriving them of their jealously guarded privileges of appointment or too greatly reducing state control. Senator Henry Wilson's act of March 3, 1863, and the supplementary legislation, were intended not so much to raise troops by draft directly as to stimulate recruiting in state organizations under the penalty of conscription if the quotas were not filled before certain dates. The provision that a drafted man might furnish a substitute or pay \$300 in commutation of service confronted the poor man with the alternative of volunteering for a large bounty or running the risk of conscription without bounty, while it enabled the man of wealth to escape service altogether. The extravagance of the system of bounties worked great injustice to poor communities, created a corrupt class of bounty brokers and deserters, caused the corrupt enlistment of unfit soldiers, and cost the nation something like three-quarters of a billion dollars. Meanwhile, though the combined effect of threatened draft and mercenary rewards was the recruiting of over a million volunteers in the ensuing two years, the draft itself netted only about 50,000 conscripts and 120,000 substitutes; and a number practically equal to the total of these became technical deserters through failure to report when drafted, while the number who evaded draft by migration and chicanery is beyond estimate.

American history of the period since the Civil War was represented by but two papers, one by Professor Fremont P. Wirth, of Peabody College, on the Disposition of the Iron Lands of Minnesota,

and one by Professor Benjamin H. Hibbard, of the University of Wisconsin, on the Recent Trend in American Farm Tenancy. Mr. Wirth described the evils which flowed from Congressional action in 1873 providing that the Mineral Act of 1872 should not apply to Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. On the discovery of iron deposits in Minnesota, the land being rated as agricultural and open to homestead entry, pre-emption, public sale, and alienation by the various forms of scrip, persons interested in securing large tracts of it employed homesteaders and pre-emptors to fill out the necessary blanks and make a few bogus improvements, or bought it cheaply under the cash purchase act of 1820, or secured it fraudulently under the Pre-emption Act of 1841.

Professor Hibbard showed that while the proportion of farm land held in tenancy, small during the period of free land, was 26 per cent. in 1880, in 1920 it was 38 per cent. The areas of farm tenancy lie in the cotton belt, the corn belt, and the wheat and tobacco districts, most of all in the first-named. The main cause of tenancy is of course the cost of farms. The higher the initial cost of the farm, the greater will be the percentage of tenancy. Outside the cotton belt tenancy is, thus far, a means toward ownership. There is very little of real absentee ownership.

It may well be a relief to the reader to turn from this arid chronicle of papers read to whatever is to be recorded of the business meeting of the Association, which took place on the last afternoon of the sessions. After all, the Association, it is to be hoped, exists for some purposes beyond the mere reading of papers, many of which, it will have been seen, add not too much to the sum of knowledge already possessed. Such an association, numerous in membership and national in scope, should do much for the advancement of historical knowledge and of historical interests which can not be accomplished by individual effort. In point of fact, the Association is doing much along these lines—if it were not, it could not with decency or with effect appeal for larger funds—and much evidence of this comes out at the business meeting. More such evidence would emerge if the old habit were resumed whereby chairmen of the many active committees reported briefly on their activities of the year.

The session opened with a memorial by the president, Dr. Andrews, of a former president of the Association, Professor George B. Adams, who had died during the year. The secretary, Professor Bassett, reported a membership, on December 15, of 2962, the largest membership ever hitherto reported, and marking a gain of 172

during the year 1925. The report of the treasurer, Dr. Charles Moore, showed net receipts of \$19,091, exclusive of contributions to the endowment fund, against net disbursements of \$15,317. A summary of this report, together with the budget voted for 1926, is printed at the end of this article. The par value of the society's endowments was stated to amount to \$46,900. As necessary means toward the prosecution of the campaign for the enlargement of the endowment fund, it was voted that \$5000 should be appropriated as salary for the executive secretary, who during his period of service devotes all his time to this work, and \$10,000 for all other expenses of the campaign, the treasurer being authorized to borrow money, to that extent, in the name of the Association, pledging its securities as collateral for the same.

Professor E. D. Adams presented a report for the Pacific Coast Branch, at whose latest annual meeting Professor O. H. Richardson was elected president, Professor Ralph H. Lutz secretary and treasurer. The committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize reported a recommendation that it should be awarded to Frederick S. Rodkey, for his monograph on *The Turko-Egyptian Question in the Relations of England, France, and Russia, 1832-1841*.<sup>4</sup> The George Louis Beer Prize was awarded to Miss Edith P. Stickney, of Goucher College, for a study of Southern Albania or Northern Epirus in European International Affairs, 1912-1923. The Jusserand Medal, now given for the first time, for a study in the history of intellectual relations between the United States and some one or more European countries, was awarded to Professor Bernard Faÿ, of the University of Clermont-Ferrand, for his work on *L'Esprit Révolutionnaire en France et aux États-Unis à la Fin du Dix-huitième Siècle*.<sup>5</sup>

Resolving to follow up Professor Dawson's inquiries, described at the Columbus meeting, with a thorough investigation of the whole field of the teaching of history in the schools, and having from the Commonwealth Fund a grant of \$10,000 toward that purpose, the Council had made Professor August C. Krey, of the University of Minnesota, chairman of its committee on that subject, and he has been set free to devote all his time to its work, till next autumn. The personnel of his committee includes representatives of other associations devoted to the social sciences, and it is hoped that the survey which the committee will conduct will result in great clarification of the professional and the public mind as to the place of his-

<sup>4</sup> *University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences*, vol. XL., nos. 3 and 4 (Urbana, 1924); see *American Historical Review*, XXX. 859.

<sup>5</sup> (Paris, Champion, 1925); *ibid.*, p. 810.

tory and other social sciences in the school curriculum, and as to the precise educational character and values of those subjects.

The Association, at the instance of the Committee on the Historical Publications of the United States Government, and on recommendation from the Council, passed resolutions urging upon Congress, in emphatic terms, the making in this session of suitable appropriations for completing the Library of Congress edition of the *Journals of the Continental Congress*; for enabling the State Department to bring up nearer to date the annual volumes of *Foreign Relations*, a series which, in spite of its great value to historians and the public, has in recent years fallen sadly into arrears; and for carrying into effect the late Senator Ralston's important act for editing for publication the papers in Washington archives relating to the territorial period of the history of the states.<sup>6</sup>

On recommendation of the Council it was voted to accept the invitation of the University of Rochester to hold there the next annual meeting. The dates will be December 28, 29, and 30. Professor Dana C. Munro was elected president of the Association for the ensuing year, Dr. Henry Osborn Taylor first vice-president, Professor James H. Breasted second vice-president. Professor Bassett and Dr. Moore were re-elected secretary and treasurer respectively. Three new members were elected to the Council, Hon. Albert J. Beveridge, Professor Laurence M. Larson, and Professor Frank M. Anderson. The Committee on Nominations elected for the ensuing year consists of Dr. Henry Barrett Learned, chairman, and Professors Herbert D. Foster, Payson J. Treat, Arthur L. Cross, and Solon J. Buck. J. F. Jameson was re-elected a member of the Board of Editors of this journal. A full list of committee assignments for 1926 follows this article.

J. F. J.

<sup>6</sup> At the time when proofs of these pages go to the printer, the House of Representatives has voted to appropriate \$20,000 for the last-named purpose, and apparently the Senate is about to do the same. The additional estimate for *Foreign Relations*, cut out by the Director of the Budget, has been left out by the House and is not likely to be restored by the Senate. The House has appropriated the usual \$7,000 for printing the *Annual Reports* of the American Historical Association but has not yet acted on the *Journals of the Continental Congress*.

## STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

## RECEIPTS

Annual dues.....		\$13,945.27
Life membership dues.....		300.00
American Historical Review, contribution.....		2,000.00
Endowment Fund contribution.....		1,041.35
Registration fees.....		201.00
Royalties .....		52.67
Publications .....		109.10
Interest:		
Endowment Fund.....	\$2,287.00	
Andrew D. White Fund.....	67.00	
George L. Beer Prize Fund.....	305.00	
Bank deposits.....	113.31	2,772.31
Miscellaneous .....		19.98
Total receipts.....		\$20,441.68
Cash on deposit, December 1, 1924.....		8,571.87
		<u>\$29,013.55</u>

## DISBURSEMENTS

Secretary and Treasurer.....		\$3,068.27
Pacific Coast Branch.....		43.13
Committees of Management:		
Nominations .....	\$77.08	
Membership .....	89.25	
Programme .....	366.35	
Local Arrangements.....	33.75	
Executive Council.....	279.53	
Endowment .....	1,786.55	
Treasurer's contingent fund.....	65.77	
List of Members.....	354.97	3,053.25
Historical Activities:		
Bibliography .....	897.87	
Publications .....	400.75	
Conference of Historical Societies.....	25.00	
Public Archives Commission.....	15.75	
Writings on American History.....	200.00	
American Council of Learned Societies.....	181.87	
History Teaching in Schools.....	180.91	
International Committee on Historical Science...	25.25	1,927.40
Prizes:		
Justin Winsor.....	200.00	
George L. Beer.....	250.00	450.00
American Historical Review.....		7,024.67
Transferred to Endowment Fund.....		3,319.31
Total disbursements.....		\$18,886.03
Cash on deposit, November 30, 1925.....		10,127.52
		<u>\$29,013.55</u>

## ENDOWMENT FUNDS

	Cost	Par Value
Principal account.....	\$35,323.00	\$35,700.00
Herbert Baxter Adams Prize.....	4,900.00	5,000.00
Andrew D. White Fund.....	1,183.00	1,200.00
George L. Beer Prize Fund.....	5,002.50	5,000.00

## BUDGET, 1926

## Receipts:

Annual dues.....	\$14,000.00
Interest on endowment and on bank balances...	2,900.00
Royalties .....	50.00
Publications .....	100.00
Registration fees.....	175.00
Government appropriation for printing Report	7,000.00
Miscellaneous .....	25.00
	<u>\$24,250.00</u>

## Disbursements:

Office of Secretary and Treasurer.....	\$3,300.00
Pacific Coast Branch.....	200.00
Committees of Management:	
Committee on Nominations.....	100.00
Committee on Membership.....	100.00
Committee on Programme.....	350.00
Committee on Local Arrangements.....	150.00
Executive Council.....	500.00
Endowment Fund.....	1,000.00
Treasurer's contingent fund.....	200.00

## Historical Activities:

Committee on Bibliography of Modern Po-	
litical History.....	500.00
Committee on Publications.....	700.00
Printing Annual Report.....	7,000.00
Conference of Historical Societies.....	25.00
Public Archives Commission.....	100.00
Writings on American History.....	200.00
American Council of Learned Societies....	175.00
Committee on Historical Research in Col-	
leges .....	50.00
Committee on History Teaching in the	
Schools .....	500.00
Delegates in the International Committee of	
Historical Sciences.....	75.00

## Prizes:

Herbert Baxter Adams Prize, 1925.....	200.00
George L. Beer Prize, 1925.....	250.00
American Historical Review.....	<u>7,000.00</u>
	\$23,175.00



## OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

*President*, Dana C. Munro, Princeton University, Princeton.

*First Vice-President*, Henry O. Taylor, 135 East 66th St., New York.

*Second Vice-President*, James H. Breasted, University of Chicago, Chicago.

*Secretary*, John S. Bassett, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

*Treasurer*, Charles Moore, Library of Congress, Washington.<sup>7</sup>

*Assistant Secretary-Treasurer*, Patty W. Washington, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington.

*Editor*, Allen R. Boyd, Library of Congress, Washington.

*Executive Council* (in addition to the above-named officers):

James Ford Rhodes<sup>8</sup>

John B. McMaster

Simeon E. Baldwin

J. Franklin Jameson

Albert Bushnell Hart

Frederick J. Turner

William M. Sloane

Andrew C. McLaughlin

George L. Burr

Worthington C. Ford

Edward Channing

Jean Jules Jusserand

Charles H. Haskins

Edward P. Cheyney

Charles M. Andrews<sup>8</sup>

Frank M. Anderson

Albert J. Beveridge

William K. Boyd

Laurence M. Larson

Charles H. McIlwain

Nellie Neilson

Arthur M. Schlesinger

Mary W. Williams

## COMMITTEES:

*Committee on Programme for the Forty-first Annual Meeting*: Laurence B. Packard, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., chairman; Dice R. Anderson, Samuel F. Bemis, Eugene H. Byrne, Bessie L. Pierce, James F. Willard; and (*ex officio*) John S. Bassett, Herbert A. Kellar, and Joseph Schafer.

*Committee on Local Arrangements*: Edward G. Miner, 2 Argyle St., Rochester, N. Y., chairman; Dexter Perkins, University of Rochester, secretary.

*Committee on Nominations*: H. Barrett Learned, 2123 Bancroft Place, Washington, chairman; Solon J. Buck, Arthur L. Cross, Herbert D. Foster, Payson J. Treat.

*Editors of the American Historical Review*: Guy Stanton Ford, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, chairman; Francis A. Christie, William E. Dodd, Sidney B. Fay, Evarts B. Greene, J. Franklin Jameson.

*Historical Manuscripts Commission*: Theodore C. Pease, University of Illinois, Urbana, chairman; Eugene C. Barker, Clarence E. Carter, Frank A. Golder, Reginald C. McGrane.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize*: C. Mildred Thompson, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., chairman; James T. Adams, Chauncey S. Boucher, Allan Nevins, Carl Wittke.

<sup>7</sup> For purposes of routine business the treasurer may be addressed at 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

<sup>8</sup> The names from that of Mr. Rhodes to that of Mr. Andrews are those of ex-presidents.

- Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize:* Carl Becker, Cornell University, chairman; Vera L. Brown, Frederic Duncalf, William L. Langer, Richard A. Newhall.
- Public Archives Commission:* George S. Godard, Hartford, Conn., chairman; John H. Edmonds, Robert B. House, Waldo G. Leland, Thomas M. Marshall, James G. Randall.
- Committee on Bibliography:* George M. Dutcher, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., chairman; William H. Allison, Solon J. Buck, Sidney B. Fay, Louis J. Paetow, Augustus H. Shearer, Henry R. Shipman.
- Committee on Bibliography of Modern English History:* Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, chairman; Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Wallace Notestein, Conyers Read.
- Committee on Publications:* H. Barrett Learned, 2123 Bancroft Place, Washington, chairman; Allen R. Boyd, Library of Congress, Washington, secretary; and (*ex officio*) John S. Bassett, William E. Dodd, J. Franklin Jameson, Theodore C. Pease, Oscar C. Stine.
- Committee on Membership:* Austin P. Evans, Columbia University, New York, chairman; Robert G. Albion, James P. Baxter, 3d, Witt Bowden, Robert D. W. Connor, Miss Martha L. Edwards, Ralph H. Gabriel, Charles W. Hackett, John D. Hicks, Ella Lonn, Donald L. Murray, Franklin C. Palm, Ulrich B. Phillips, Mrs. Bessie L. Priddy, J. Fred Rippy.
- Conference of Historical Societies:* Arthur C. Cole, University of Ohio, Columbus, chairman; Joseph Schafer, Wisconsin State Historical Society, secretary.
- Committee on the National Archives:* J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, chairman; Tyler Dennett, Charles Moore, Eben Putnam, James B. Wilbur.
- Committee on Hereditary Patriotic Societies:* Dixon R. Fox, Columbia University, New York, chairman; Arthur Adams, Natalie S. Lincoln, Mrs. Annie L. Sioussat.
- Committee on History Teaching in the Schools:* August C. Krey, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, chairman; John S. Bassett, Guy S. Ford, Ernest Horn, Henry Johnson, William E. Lingelbach, Jesse Newlon, Leon C. Marshall, Charles E. Merriam.
- Committee on Endowment:* Albert J. Beveridge,<sup>9</sup> 4164 Washington Blvd., Indianapolis, chairman; Solon J. Buck, 110 Library Building, Columbia University, New York, executive secretary; Charles M. Andrews, John S. Bassett,<sup>9</sup> Harry A. Cushing,<sup>9</sup> Guy S. Ford, Worthington C. Ford,<sup>9</sup> Evarts B. Greene,<sup>9</sup> Charles H. Haskins, J. Franklin Jameson,<sup>9</sup> Edward B. Krehbiel,<sup>9</sup> H. Barrett Learned, Charles Moore,<sup>9</sup> William A. Morris, Dana C. Munro,<sup>9</sup> Stewart L. Mims,<sup>9</sup> Conyers Read, Otto L. Schmidt, Henry M. Wriston.
- Committee on Obtaining Transcripts from Foreign Archives:* Charles M. Andrews, 424 St. Ronan St., New Haven, chairman; Waldo G. Leland, Wallace Notestein.
- Delegates in the American Council of Learned Societies:* Charles H. Haskins, J. Franklin Jameson.

<sup>9</sup> Members of the executive committee of the Committee on Endowment.

*Committee on the George L. Beer Prize:* Bernadotte E. Schmitt, University of Chicago, chairman; Alfred L. P. Dennis, Edward M. Earle, Robert H. Lord, Charles Seymour.

*Committee on Historical Research in Colleges:* William K. Boyd, Duke University, Durham, N. C., chairman; E. Merton Coulter, Asa E. Martin, Fred A. Shannon, William W. Sweet.

*Committee on the Documentary Historical Publications of the United States Government:* J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, chairman; Charles M. Andrews, John S. Bassett, Worthington C. Ford, Andrew C. McLaughlin, John B. McMaster, Charles Moore, Frederick J. Turner.

*Representatives in the International Committee of Historical Science:* James T. Shotwell, 406 West 117th Street, New York; Waldo G. Leland, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

*Committee on Preparing a Programme for Research and Publication:* Dana C. Munro, Princeton University, Princeton, chairman; William K. Boyd, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Marcus W. Jernegan, Arthur M. Schlesinger.

*Committee on the Jusserand Medal:* Charles Moore, Library of Congress, Washington, chairman; Charles H. Haskins, David J. Hill.

*Delegates in the Social Science Research Council:* William E. Dodd, Guy S. Ford, Arthur M. Schlesinger.

## MASSACHUSETTS AND THE COMMON LAW: THE DECLARATION OF 1646

THE theory of the transplantation of the common law to this country has given rise to a moot question in American legal history. The dicta of our modern decisions, predicated in large measure on untenable historical grounds, are of little service in the study of this problem.<sup>1</sup> One reason for misapprehension has been the undue weight accorded to authorized statements of legal policy. In Massachusetts pre-eminently, historians, in seeking to comprehend the *rationale* of early legal development, have here encountered a decoy leading far afield. The remonstrance to the Massachusetts General Court of Robert Child and other recalcitrants in 1646 is a case in point, wherein the "vindication technique" employed with finesse by the administration has been accepted with implicit faith.<sup>2</sup>

"An obscure episode in colonial history", says Charles Francis Adams<sup>3</sup> of the Robert Child affair; but recent critical treatment is of much value in shedding light on the motives of the petitioners,<sup>4</sup> men

<sup>1</sup> See R. C. Dale, "The Adoption of the Common Law by the American Colonies", *Amer. Law Reg.*, n. s., XXI. 554. See also opinion of West, legal advisor of the Board of Trade, in Chalmers, *Opinions of Eminent Lawyers on various Points of English Jurisprudence chiefly concerning the Colonies* (Burlington, 1858), p. 206. For the view that common law was enforced in absence of specific legislation, see *Comm. v. Churchill*, 2 Metc. Mass. 123; *Sackett v. Sackett*, 8 Pick. 309; for view that adoption and usage is essential, see *Comm. v. Leach*, 1 Mass. 60, 61. In this connection, see dicta of Shaw, C. J., in *Comm. v. Hunt*, 4 Metc. Mass. 122, to the effect that "laws for the purpose of regulating wages of laborers, the settlement of paupers . . . not being adapted to the circumstances of our colonial conditions . . . were not adopted, used or approved". See *contra*, *Mass. Col. Rec.*, I. 109, 111; *Colonial Laws of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1889), pp. 174, 183, 184; "Andros Records", *Amer. Ant. Soc. Proceedings*, n. s., XIII. 486.

<sup>2</sup> A popular demand for security against the arbitrary power of the judiciary marks the early history of Massachusetts law. Prior to 1634, such legislation as emanated from the General Court was of a desultory character. In the second half of the decade successive committees were appointed to grapple with the problem of codification. John Cotton's "Moses his Judicalls" (1636)—a proposed draft of Pentateuchal law—embraced the first fruits of this effort; the second, the Nathaniel Ward draft, bearing significant parallels to its predecessor, presumably formed the basis for the Body of Liberties (1641), the authorized code of fundamental liberties, immunities, and sanctions.

<sup>3</sup> *Massachusetts, its Historians and its History* (Boston, 1893), pp. 59, 60.

<sup>4</sup> See Kittredge, "Dr. Robert Child the Remonstrant", *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XXI. 1-146. In justice it should be mentioned that almost thirty years prior to Adams's remarks, Marvin in his introduction to *New England's Jonas* (Boston, 1869) had cast much light on the circumstances of the petition.

of vision and independence of spirit, willing, perhaps even anxious, to suffer official discipline for their variegated convictions. The remonstrants under date of May 6, 1646, posited these grievances against the Puritan régime: disqualification, both civil and religious, for sectarian non-conformity; and the absence of "a settled form of government according to the laws of England". They requested wholesale incorporation of English law and cast aspersions upon the colonial attempts to reform a legal system, which the English people "by many yeares experience have found most equall and just".<sup>5</sup> The criticism, following quickly upon the Gorton and Vassall protests to the home government, awakened apprehension on the part of the authorities as to such publicity,<sup>6</sup> and a threatened appeal to Parliament<sup>7</sup> was a fillip to immediate action. On October 7, 1646, Winthrop, Dudley, Bellingham, and Nathaniel Duncan were commissioned by the General Court "to draw up such an answer" to the remonstrance "as they thinke meete".<sup>8</sup> The answer which they thought meet is the Declaration of 1646. It consists of a prefatory section in reply to the first two charges of Child *et al.*, supplemented by brief statements of the fundamental laws in England and Massachusetts, which, for convenience, may be called the *Parallels*. The specific technique is explained in the introduction:

And because this will better appear [*i.e.*, conformity of colonial laws with English law], we shall draw them into a parallel. In the one columnne we will sett down the fundamental and common lawes and customes of England, beginning with Magna Charta, and so on to such others as we had occasion to make use of, or may at present suit with our small beginnings: In the other columnne we will sett downe the summe of such lawes and customes as are in force and use in this jurisdiction, shewing withall (where occasion serves) how they are warranted by our charter.

Historians have never subjected these *Parallels* to critical analysis, and have generally accepted the confident conclusion of the editors that by the *Parallels* "it may appeare that our politie and fundamentalls are framed according to the lawes of England, and according to the charter".<sup>9</sup> Hubbard, representing the quasi-official attitude of

<sup>5</sup> *Hutchinson Papers* (Prince Society), I. 214 *et seq.*

<sup>6</sup> Winthrop, *Hist. of N. E. (or Journal)*, ed. by James Savage (Boston, 1853), II. 284. The memorial had scarcely reached the General Court before "copies were dispersed into the hand of some ill-affected people in the forts adjoining", and even as far as "the Dutch plantation, Virginia, and Bermuda". Winslow, "New England's Salamander", Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections*, third ser., II. 116.

<sup>7</sup> "If not [received], we and they shall be necessitated to apply our humble desires to the Honorable Houses of Parliament." *New England's Jonas*, pp. 13-15.

<sup>8</sup> *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England*, II. 162.

<sup>9</sup> This is asserted also by Winthrop, *Journal*, I. 288.

seventeenth-century American Puritanism, argued on the basis of this document "what little discrepancy there was, *if any*, between the fundamental laws of Magna Charta and the New England liberties".<sup>10</sup> In Neal's quaint account, the Hingham and Child incidents are so combined as to be seriously misleading.<sup>11</sup> The nineteenth-century apologists of the Puritan era are alike uncritical. "The court", says Palfrey sympathetically, "argued their case with equal circumspection and boldness."<sup>12</sup> Neither Ellis<sup>13</sup> nor Gray<sup>14</sup> notes any discrepancy in the *Parallels*. Even among writers like Brooks Adams<sup>15</sup> and Oliver, who assuredly bore no brief for the Puritan régime, there is not much serious criticism. The latter indeed suggests that at some points the *Parallels* are "liable to exception",<sup>16</sup> but there is no elaboration of this point, and without further investigation one might reasonably regard it in the light of the author's generally splenetic treatment. Osgood, writing with more scientific detachment, concedes that the comparison was not exhaustive, but insists upon "a very satisfactory agreement, so far as the letter of the law concerning property, family relations, and the administration of justice went".<sup>17</sup> Among the special students of the Child affair, Marvin<sup>18</sup> speaks of the ability with which the Declaration was drawn, and Kittredge in his exhaustive study of the episode dismisses the document as being "too well known to invite comment".<sup>19</sup> Special students of early colonial law have contributed little in this instance. Hilkey<sup>20</sup> mentions the rejoinder of the court, but attempts no analysis of the *Parallels*, and Reinsch<sup>21</sup> makes only a passing allusion to them. Washburn, Reno, and Davis, in their special treatments of the judicial history of Massachusetts, are silent. So, too, W. C. Fowler.

The most important treatment of the subject appears in F. C. Gray's monograph, "Remarks on the Early Laws of Massachusetts

<sup>10</sup> "History of New England", Mass. Hist. Soc., *Collections*, second ser., V. 113.

<sup>11</sup> *History of New England* (London, 1720), I. 213-215.

<sup>12</sup> *History of New England* (Boston, 1892), II. 174.

<sup>13</sup> *Puritan Age and Rule in Massachusetts* (Boston, 1888), p. 204.

<sup>14</sup> "Remarks on the Early Laws of Massachusetts Bay", Mass. Hist. Soc., *Collections*, third ser., VIII. 191 *et seq.* See below.

<sup>15</sup> *Emancipation of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1886), p. 89.

<sup>16</sup> *The Puritan Commonwealth* (Boston, 1856), p. 427.

<sup>17</sup> *American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*, I. 260.

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. xxix.

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 31.

<sup>20</sup> *Legal Development in Colonial Massachusetts, 1630-1686* (New York, 1910), p. 66.

<sup>21</sup> "The English Common Law in the Early American Colonies", *Select Essays in Anglo-American Legal History*, I. 381.

Bay".<sup>22</sup> The writer attempts to prove the authenticity of the Body of Liberties, the law code of 1641, to discredit the claim that John Cotton's earlier proposed draft, "Moses his Judicials", might have been the basis for the Liberties, and attaches little significance to the Pentateuchal *motif* in Puritan law. He adduces the following statistics:

In this [*i.e.*, the *Parallels*] they set forth forty-four fundamental propositions, annexing to each the authorities for it. Six times they refer for authority to their Charter,—seven times to Custom,—eight times to laws of specified dates,—once to the Bible,—and twenty-seven times to the "Liberties", citing each by its appropriate number. Now the provisions thus cited by them from the Body of Liberties, as their fundamental laws, are not to be found, in form or in substance, in this Abstract. How can this then have been the basis of their Code?<sup>23</sup>

Whitmore, editor of the Massachusetts colonial laws, pursuing the same argument as to the potency of the common-law influence on the code of 1641, accepts the Declaration as authoritative evidence of the substantial agreement between the colonial and the common law.<sup>24</sup>

The present writer is convinced that Gray and Whitmore were mistaken and that the question whether the Declaration with its *Parallels* is a safe guide to the study of early Massachusetts law still challenges attention. In determining this point it will be necessary to consider not only the legal materials included within the *Parallels* but also certain important legal practices which the compilers did not see fit to mention.

1. *The Parallels and the Area of Inclusion.* In the column representing the Massachusetts law, Liberty 1, wherein the word of God is adduced in defect of statutory law, is cited along with Magna Charta (a very questionable precedent). This was good Calvinism and permitted a wide field of departure from the common-law tradition.<sup>25</sup> Liberty 1 further provides for the infliction of capital punishment according to the word of God, and the *Parallels* extend this rule to include all criminal cases for which there are no specific penalties,

<sup>22</sup> As cited in note 14, above, p. 195.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> *Mass. Col. Laws*, p. 19.

<sup>25</sup> In early English law resort to the law of nature was not characteristic. Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, II. 512, 513. But see *Doctor and Student*, Dial. I., c. XI.; *Parl. Hist.*, I. 1046. A more plausible analogy than in the *Parallels* is offered by Eliot in his injunction "to fetch out of the Word of God making that their only Magna Charta". "Christian Commonwealth", *Mass. Hist. Soc., Collections*, third ser., IX. 144. For a similar observation during the Commonwealth period in England, see Keble, in Howell, *State Trials*, V. 172.



rather audaciously citing the charter as authority.<sup>26</sup> The *Parallels* concede that under the common law in such cases penalties should be prescribed "according to the nature and merit of the offences". In either case the judge's discretion was given a dangerous latitude.<sup>27</sup> In the light of Winthrop's plea in his *Arbitrary Government* (1644) that the legislature should provide no definite penalties except in capital cases—the adjudication to be made in each individual case by the magistrate, proceeding according to the word of God as revealed specifically in the Mosaic dispensation<sup>28</sup>—the full significance of this attitude can be appreciated.

Liberty 65 provides: "No custome or prescription shall ever prevaile amongst us in any morall cause, our meaneing is maintaine any-thing that can be proved to be morrallie sinful by the word of god." The editors, averse from including anything which might detract from the desired effect, prudently omitted the second clause. The Puritan theory of the identity of law and morality, sin and crime, was proposed in substance in England by the law committee of 1653,<sup>29</sup> but was hardly common-law practice.

Liberty 81, in accord with Deuteronomy 21:15-17, provided for inheritance by the eldest son of a double share of the real and personal estate in case the parent died intestate.<sup>30</sup> This was at variance with general common-law practice;<sup>31</sup> but the *Parallels* claim the authority of English law for the rule that "the eldest sonne is preferred before the younger in the ancestors inheritance". In this connection the assertion has frequently been made that the colonists repudiated the inapplicable rule of primogeniture, and the charter of 1629, providing

<sup>26</sup> Yet in reply to a query propounded by the elders in 1644, the court confessed "we do not find by the patent they are expressly directed to proceed according to the word of God", but maintained the privilege nevertheless. *Records*, II, 91.

<sup>27</sup> Among the offensive charges in the letters of the "Gortonoges", which Winslow summarizes, appears this: "That the whole Word of God is a parable to them, as their conversation in all points daily declare it." *Hypocrisie Unmasked*, ed. by H. M. Chapin (Providence, 1916), p. 40.

<sup>28</sup> *Life and Letters*, II, 445 et seq.

<sup>29</sup> Robinson, "Anticipations under the Commonwealth of Changes in the Law", *Select Essays*, I, 483.

<sup>30</sup> The assertion of Andrews that "for more than sixty years it [i.e., the intestacy law] existed as a custom in no way binding on the people", and that "it did not become a law in Massachusetts until 1692" ("The Influence of Colonial Conditions as Illustrated in the Connecticut Intestacy Law", *ibid.*, p. 437), appears untenable in view of the specific provisions of the codes of 1641, 1648, and 1660. For some instances of judicial enforcement in the early period, see *Records of the Court of Assistants*, II, 97, 286; *Essex County Court Records*, I, 206, 387; VII, 180; Suffolk Court Files, no. 333.

<sup>31</sup> Blackstone, *Commentaries*, IV, 214.

as it did for tenure as of the "Manor of East-Greenwich, in our County of Kent, in free and common Socage, and not in Capite, nor by Knights' Service",<sup>32</sup> has been interpreted to signify gavelkind tenure, which, by presumption of law, was the common law of Kent.<sup>33</sup> This tenure provides for equal inheritance among the sons.<sup>34</sup> The authority of the crown to create gavelkind and its customary decedent rules has been challenged,<sup>35</sup> but in any case, neither primogeniture nor gavelkind partible descent was in force in Massachusetts Bay at the time of the Declaration.

Similarly misleading was the claim of common-law authority for paragraph 13 of the Massachusetts "Fundamentals", which reads as follows: "Treason, murther, witchcraft, sodomie, and other notorious crimes are punished with death: But theft, etc. is not so punished, because we read otherwise in the scripture. Capitalls, etc." In the common-law column it is asserted that "simple theft and some other felonies are not punished with death, if the offender can reade in Scripture". High treason, the highest crime at common law, consisting of various acts of disloyalty to the sovereign, was not then capital in Massachusetts. Capital law no. 12 in the Body of Liberties recognizes only treason against the commonwealth. Such disloyalty to a corporation could hardly be comprised within the meaning of petit treason at common law. Larceny above the value of 12 *d.* was a capital felony in England.<sup>36</sup> The colonial punishment generally enforced was whipping in minor cases of theft<sup>37</sup> and double or

<sup>32</sup> Poore, *Federal and State Constitutions*, etc., I. 926.

<sup>33</sup> Somner, *A Treatise of Gavelkind*, second ed. (London, 1726), p. 44; *Robinson on Gavelkind, the Common Law of Kent*, fifth ed., edited by C. I. Elston and H. J. H. Mackay (London, 1897), p. 44; *Randall v. Wrettal*, 3 Keb. 214, 216.

<sup>34</sup> Littleton, *Treatise of Tenures*, ed. by T. E. Tomlins (London, 1841), bk. III., ch. II., p. 305, for Customal of Kent.

<sup>35</sup> Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 55. The present writer has considered the contention of Egleston ("Land System of N. E. Colonies", *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, IV. 558) that the words "as of the manor of East Greenwich" were used, not with reference to gavelkind, "but simply to negative the otherwise necessary inference that the grant was to be held *in capite*, or, to speak more accurately, *ut de corona*". His authority, Lowe's case (*Works of Francis Bacon*, London, 1730, IV. 113-120), does not seem to apply to this sort of grant. For colonial attitude, see, *e.g.*, *Col. Records*, V. 199.

<sup>36</sup> Coke, *Third Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England* (London, 1809), p. 109. Here petit larceny, a non-capital felony (Coke, *First Institute*, Phila., 1826, III. 109), should not in extenuation of the colonial position be identified with "simple larceny", defined by Blackstone as "plain theft unaccompanied with any other atrocious circumstance". *Comm.*, IV. 229. Despite the common-law penalty for larceny, the *Middlesex* (England) *Session Rolls* for the period, 1625-1668, reveal that benefit of clergy was effectually pleaded in 67 instances, whereas the death penalty was imposed in but 27.

<sup>37</sup> See *Rec. Ct. Assistants*, II. 9, 13, 19, 32, 40, 59, 66, 81, 83, 86, 97, 118.

treble restitution to the injured party, in accord with Exodus 22:4.<sup>38</sup> The editors of the Declaration missed an excellent opportunity, honestly and without equivocation to evince a reformatory interest in the criminal law and refute the insinuation of the petitioners: "We likewise desire that no greater punishments be inflicted upon offenders than are allowed and sett by the laws of our native country."<sup>39</sup> In contemporary England robbery<sup>40</sup> and burglary<sup>41</sup> were non-clergyable felonies. In Massachusetts, by the law of 1642, capital punishment in either case was not inflicted until the third offense.<sup>42</sup>

In other cases the Massachusetts criminal law was more severe. Fundamental 14 reads: "Adultery is punished according to the canon of the spiritual law, viz., the scripture. Capitalls, etc." and in neat juxtaposition we find this vague reference to the common law: "Adultery is referred to the canon or spiritual lawe." Adultery was a statutory felony in Massachusetts, triable in the civil courts and punishable by death.<sup>43</sup> In England the spiritual courts punished this offense in a most desultory way, if at all.<sup>44</sup> Likewise blasphemy<sup>45</sup> and perjury endangering life<sup>46</sup> were punished capitally in Massachusetts, contrary to English precedent.<sup>47</sup> In short, there is

<sup>38</sup> See *ibid.*, pp. 32, 66, 70, 83, 108, 118, 134, 137; *Col. Records, Mass.*, II. 180.

<sup>39</sup> *Hutchinson Papers*, p. 220.

<sup>40</sup> Coke, *Third Instit.*, pp. 67-69, a "crimen improbissimum"; 1 Edw. VI., c. 12: 10; 8 Eliz. c. 4: 3; 39 Eliz. c. 15. Dalton, *Countrey Justice*, p. 231.

<sup>41</sup> 1 Edw. VI., c. 12 and 18 Eliz., c. 7 took clergy away from the principals. Dalton, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

<sup>42</sup> *Col. Records*, I. 22. Not only is there no distinction between day and night, but the vital common-law provision requiring felonious intent is absent. See, for non-capital penalties, *Rec. Ct. Assistants*, II. 79, 132.

<sup>43</sup> *Col. Records*, I. 301, and Liberty 94, s. 9. For actual enforcement, see *Rec. Ct. Assistants*, II. 286 (1643-1644).

<sup>44</sup> Pollock and Maitland, *History of English Law* (Cambridge, 1895), II. 542, 543; Coke, *Third Instit.*, p. 205. A distinct reflex of the Puritan point of view is found in the Commonwealth act of 1650 making adultery a non-clergyable felony with mitigating circumstances. Scobell's *Acts*, pt. 2, p. 121; Blackstone, *Comm.*, III. 139.

<sup>45</sup> Not capital at common law. *Comm.*, IV. 49.

<sup>46</sup> Although perjury at common law was punished by fine and imprisonment (Coke, *Third Instit.*, p. 163), the Massachusetts law providing the death penalty for one who perjures "wittingly and of purpose to take away any man's life" (Deut. 19: 16-19) is directly repugnant to the common law, which makes the "monstrous exception" of exempting from penalty a perjurer in a capital trial for reasons of dubious public policy. Stephens, *History of the Criminal Law of England* (London, 1883), III. 246, 247; *Comm.*, IV. 197. For a colonial criticism, see charge of Hutchinson, C. J., to grand jury, 1768. Quincy, p. 281.

<sup>47</sup> As an earnest of "good faith", on the very day that the Declaration appears to have been ratified, Nov. 4, 1646, the court reiterated its assertion that blasphemy was capital and added two more capital offenses without parallel at

considerable discrepancy between non-clergyable felonies in England and capital crimes in Massachusetts Bay. As to the *Parallels* themselves, the conclusion seems necessary that such statements of important law as are included are often incomplete, garbled, and misleading.

2. *The Area of Exclusion: Neglected Legal Practices.* Among the Liberties which the editors neglect to include in the *Parallels* several diverge markedly from the common law: Liberty 43, providing for forty as the maximum number of stripes to be inflicted, "gentlemen" exempted (Deuteronomy 25: 2, 3); Liberties 85-88, the four laws of servitude, humanitarian in character, and based on Deuteronomy 23: 15, 16; Leviticus 25: 39, 40, 43; Exodus 23: 12; 21: 2, for which common-law precedent could not be conveniently found; Liberty 80, protecting the wife from bodily correction;<sup>48</sup> and Liberties 92 and 93 for the protection of animals against cruel treatment, significant in their divergence from the hard common-law concept of animals as possessed of no rights.<sup>49</sup>

Certain important legal practices, not necessarily included in the Liberties and prudently omitted from the *Parallels*, deserve mention. In legal procedure there are evidences that the privilege of testifying in one's own behalf was sometimes extended to parties in civil suits contrary to the common law.<sup>50</sup> Deeds required signature in the presence of witnesses,<sup>51</sup> while at common law it is still a debatable issue whether the Statute of Frauds (1677) made a signature essential to the validity of a contract under seal.<sup>52</sup> The courts, contrary to Dean Pound's theory as to the Puritan abhorrence of equity,<sup>53</sup> early assumed chancery jurisdiction.<sup>54</sup> Such chancery jurisdiction was common law—cursing or smiting parents and incorrigible behavior of sons above sixteen (Exod. 21: 15, 17; Levit. 20: 9; Deut. 22: 20, 21). *Col. Records*, II, 179; *The Book of the General Lawes and Libertyes* (Cambridge, 1648), capital laws, nos. 14, 15, pp. 5, 6.

<sup>48</sup> Common law granted the husband the privilege of moderate chastizement, *Comm.*, I, 444. See dicta, Braley, J., in *Nolin v. Pearson*, 191 Mass. 283.

<sup>49</sup> Bishop, *New Criminal Law*, I, 595. For observation as to the English point of view in 1700, see Botsford, *English Society in the Eighteenth Century as influenced from Oversea* (New York, 1924), pp. 313, 314.

<sup>50</sup> *Sherman v. Keayne*, *Col. Records*, II, 40; *Winthrop, Journal*, II, 83, 143. *Contra*: *Morris v. Chamberlayne* (Virginia, 1735), *Va. Col. Dec.*, II, 51, where the common-law rule was invoked.

<sup>51</sup> Hilkey, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

<sup>52</sup> That it does, see *Comm.*, II, 306. The better view it seems is that the Statute of Frauds did not in its requirements of a signature include instruments under seal. Aigler, *Titles*, p. 275.

<sup>53</sup> *Interpretations of Legal History* (Cambridge, 1923), pp. 103, 104.

<sup>54</sup> Lechford, "Plain Dealing", in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Collections*, third ser., III.

exercised in decreeing the cancellation and re-execution of a deed, in redemption of land from mortgages, in cases of charitable trust, specific performance by executor of a testator's contract, sequestration of lands, mistake, and fraud.<sup>55</sup>

Marriage, in England an ecclesiastical function, came under civil purview in Massachusetts in accordance with the Calvinist attitude; ecclesiastical jurisdiction over suits for breach of promise of marriage<sup>56</sup> and divorce was assumed by the civil courts. Grounds which in England would have been considered merely cause for a separation *a mensa et thoro* were in Massachusetts sufficient for a decree *a vinculo matrimonii*. Desertion,<sup>57</sup> adultery,<sup>58</sup> refusal to perform the marital obligation,<sup>59</sup> and cruelty<sup>60</sup> were all grounds for divorce, whereas in England, even after the act of 1653 providing for civil marriage, that union was accorded "all the inviolability of a sacrament", nor was there any "trace of any proposal to introduce . . . any system of divorce".<sup>61</sup>

The identification of untruth with malicious criminal defamation was a forward-looking legal practice, rarely, if ever, credited to the American Puritans. "It is not material whether a libel be true", said Coke in 1609.<sup>62</sup> Indeed at common law the old maxim was, "The greater the truth, the greater the libel". Yet the Massachusetts law of 1645, antedating the Zenger trial by almost ninety years, made it a criminal offense for any person at the age of discretion (fourteen years) "to wittingly and willingly make or publish any lye, which may be pernicious to the public weal, or with intent to deceive and abuse the people with false news and reports".<sup>63</sup> The truth, no justification at common law in criminal libel, was a good defense.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>55</sup> See Woodruff, "Chancery in Massachusetts", *Law Quarterly Review*, V. 370-386, and cases cited.

<sup>56</sup> Howard, *History of Matrimonial Institutions*, II. 200-203.

<sup>57</sup> Bachiler's case, *Rec. Essex Ct.*, I. 191; *Col. Records*, IV. 282.

<sup>58</sup> Clarke's case, *Col. Records*, II. 86.

<sup>59</sup> Clement's case, *Col. Records*, IV. 259, 269.

<sup>60</sup> See testimony of Governor Hutchinson, *History of Massachusetts*, I. 393, that "in matters of divorce they left the rules of the canon law out of the question".

<sup>61</sup> Inderwick, *The Interregnum* (London, 1891), p. 46. There were, however, instances of annulments. *Middlesex County Records*, III. 233, 234, 264.

<sup>62</sup> *De Libellis Famosis*, 5 Rep. 125a; Hudson, *Treatise of the Court of Starre Chamber*, pp. 138, 139 (MS., Columbia Law School Library).

<sup>63</sup> *Col. Records*, II. 104; *Laws*, 1648, pp. 35, 36; *Col. Laws*, p. 171.

<sup>64</sup> *Comm. v. Farrington*, *Rec. Essex*, I. 171 (1649); *Comm. v. Fowler*, *ibid.*, p. 224 (1651); and see also *Rex v. Dyer*, *Records of the Court of General Sessions of the Peace of Worcester County*, 1736-1737, p. 173.

Slander as well as libel could be criminal,<sup>65</sup> although not in the ordinary sense at common law.<sup>66</sup>

Not alone in the abstracts of laws included in the *Parallels* do we find evasion, but the very absence from the Declaration of many important legal practices of a pioneer character bears eloquent testimony to its apologetic nature. The *Parallels* are by no means comprehensive. When the Massachusetts common and statute law differed from English precedent, any allusion thereto is generally excluded. Only twenty-two of the ninety-eight Liberties are referred to, and, taken by themselves, the Liberties, as we have seen, are by no means inclusive statements of legal theory and practice. The pronounced disinclination to confess a legal policy at variance with English law is reflected in a memorandum noted by Winthrop under date of November, 1639, in which he admits that the delay in acceding to the will of the people in their demand for codification was due to the belief that laws "should arise *pro re nata* upon occasions" and that specific legislation "would professedly transgress the limits of our charter, which provide we shall make no laws repugnant to the laws of England, and that we are assured we must do".<sup>67</sup> The Declaration bears evidence throughout of considerable ignorance of the common law on the part of its sponsors—this despite the fact that all of the members of the drafting committee had had some form of legal training abroad.

The obvious conclusion, then, is that the Declaration of 1646 is not a fair presentation of fundamental law in this constructive period. Disingenuousness marks the document. Far more courageous was the reply of the General Court to the petitioners themselves:

Our allegiance binds us not to the laws of England any longer than while we live in England, for the laws of the parliament of England reach no further, nor do the king's writs under the great seal go any further. . . . And whereas they seem to admit of laws not repugnant, etc., if by repugnant they mean, as the word truly imports, and as by the charter must needs be intended, they have no cause to complain, for we have no laws . . . contrary to the law of God and of right reason, which the

<sup>65</sup> See *Rec. Assistants*, II. 109; *Rec. Essex*, I. 156, 196, 224; *id.*, II. 196; see also *Torrey v. Rex*, *Worcester Records*, 1733-1734, p. 97, and *Rex v. Parsons*, *ibid.*, 1734-1735, p. 120, which affords interesting comparison with *Rex v. Stonehouse*, 3 Salk. (1696) 188. These precedents would be of interest to Justice May, who in his *Law of Crimes*, p. 176, says: "No instance has been found of an indictment for mere verbal slander against an individual in this country, nor is it indictable in England." Slander was also indictable in Virginia (*Lower Norfolk County Records*, 1632-1640, p. 22) and in Pennsylvania. (See Gipson, *Journal Amer. Instit. of Crim. Law and Criminology*, VI. 325, and cases cited.)

<sup>66</sup> Coke, *Third Instit.*, p. 198.

<sup>67</sup> *Journal*, I. 388, 389.

learned in those laws have anciently and still do hold forth as the fundamental basis of their laws, and that, if anything hath been otherwise established, it was an error, and not a law, being against the intent of the law-makers, however it may bear the form of a law (in regard of the stamp of authority set upon it) until it be revoked.<sup>68</sup>

An allegiance such as the court describes "involved privileges without corresponding duties", is the trenchant summation of Osgood.<sup>69</sup> The Declaration of 1646 was one of the principal documents employed by Winslow in his successful presentation of the colonial attitude before the home government,<sup>70</sup> and when the true nature of this paper is even dimly perceived, much light is cast upon the statement of Captain Johnson that the authorities "thought meet to send over this year the honored Mr. Winslow to manifest and declare the naked truth of things".<sup>71</sup>

RICHARD B. MORRIS.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 352. For a similar honest renunciation of English law, see Winslow, "New England's Salamander", *op. cit.*, p. 137. Indeed, the practical effect of the attack on Massachusetts law was to make the law code committee of 1647 more assertive. In the preamble to the code of 1648, we find the codifiers asserting that the rules of civil polity were framed according to the law of God, and further: "*That distinction which is put between the Lawes of God and the lawes of men, becomes a snare to many as it is mis-applied on the ordering of their obedience to civil Authorities; for when the Authoritie is of God, and that in way of an Ordinance Rom. 13.1, and when the administration of it is according to deductions, and rules gathered from the word of God, and the clear light of nature in civil nations, surely there is no human law that tendeth to common good (according to those principles) but the same is mediately a law of God, and that in way of an Ordinance which all are to submit unto and that for conscience sake. Rom. 13.5.*"

<sup>69</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 262.

<sup>70</sup> "It is ordered that a copy of the petition of Doctor Child, etc., and our charge and their answers, or sentence thereupon, and declaration of the Courts apprehension of their petition, etc., be delivered to Mr. Winslow to make use of in England as occasion may require." (Nov. 4, 1646.) *Col. Records*, II. 175.

<sup>71</sup> *Wonder-Working Providence of Sions Saviour in New England*, ed. by W. F. Poole (Andover, 1867), p. 203. Here again "truth" was triumphant, for in 1648, Winslow was able to write that their "hopes and endeavours . . . had been blasted by the Special providence of the Lord who still wrought for us". Winthrop, *Journal*, II. 321.



## THE CORPS OF LIGHT INFANTRY IN THE CONTINENTAL ARMY

THE Duc de Broglie, who commanded the French army in 1760 operating against Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, organized for the campaign in each of his battalions a company of selected men, "chasseurs", whose duty was to skirmish in front of the line, protect the columns of march, and do the outpost service.<sup>1</sup> This was the first reappearance on the battlefields of Europe for over a hundred years of light infantry, troops whose normal combat formation was that of the skirmisher. Since the time of Louis XIV. there had been what were known as "light troops", but these were separate organizations, operating away from the army, partizans, men without discipline. The chasseurs of Broglie, on the other hand, were selected from the battalion and operated always with the line. By 1776, in every infantry battalion France had her chasseur company, England her light company, and Spain her company of *cazadores*. The German states had battalions of *jäger*, usually separate bodies, armed with the rifle, the only European light infantry of the period using this weapon.

August 28, 1777, while Washington was at Wilmington, he organized a corps of light infantry composed of nine officers and 108 men, including the sergeants, drawn from each infantry brigade, commanded by General Maxwell. John Marshall said that this body was to replace Morgan's Riflemen, ordered to join the army in the North.<sup>2</sup> Washington in a letter to Congress two days after their organization said: "Sensible of the advantages of Light Troops, I have formed a Corps under the command of a Brigadier, by drafting a Hundred from each Brigade which is to be constantly near the enemy and give 'em every possible annoyance."<sup>3</sup>

Washington was evidently satisfied with this new class of troops and in a long letter to Congress of January 28, on the subject of army reorganization, he recommended that in each battalion there be a light company, men selected from the whole; that these be organized into brigades and commanded by general officers of the line selected by the commander-in-chief. This light corps, with attached light horse, would constitute the "flying army".<sup>4</sup> Acting upon this recommenda-

<sup>1</sup> Duc de Broglie, *Correspondance Inédite* (Paris, 1903), I. 9.

<sup>2</sup> *Life of Washington*, III. 141.

<sup>3</sup> *Writings of Washington* (ed. Ford), VI. 57.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, VI. 307.

tion, Congress, May 27, provided that in each battalion, under the new organization of the army, there should be a light company; all light companies to be organized into a corps during a campaign.<sup>5</sup> In August, 1778, when the corps was called out for a new campaign under General Scott, we notice in the orders for its reorganization that it began to assume the character of a *corps d'élite*, as witnessed by the qualifications for the men selected. They were to be the best men, the most hardy and active marksmen, commanded by good partizan officers. The field and company officers were announced in general orders, four colonels to command regiments, each with his lieutenant-colonel and major.

For the campaign of 1779 a new system of organization for the infantry of the entire army was introduced through the efforts of Baron von Steuben; regiments were to be organized into battalions of uniform strength, using, if necessary, a system of consolidation; and the orders of early June giving this new organization gave the exact number of light infantry to be furnished by each of these new battalions. Light infantry drafts were to be selected men, and line battalions were now required to maintain their light companies up to the required strength. On June 15, the light infantry was organized into two regiments, each of four battalions of four companies; to facilitate administration, brigades were given quartermasters, forage-masters, and conductors of military stores. This latter official marched with several wagons of extra ammunition, drawn from the commander of the artillery, provided spare parts for muskets, and had with him, also, a travelling forge for the repair of small arms.<sup>6</sup> The corps was inspected in June by Colonel Alexander Scammell, adjutant-general, and his report shows that the light infantry were drawn from the Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia lines, the strength of a company consisting of forty-one privates; sixteen companies in all were organized. The following were the remarks placed on the report by the inspector:

The above companies almost to a man are composed of proper sized well built men from five feet seven to five feet nine inches high, who have been in Actual Service two, three, and Some almost four years, a very few excepted, who are natives. Four only out of the sixteen companies were ordered to be exchanged for better men. The arms and accoutrements (except in the 8th Va. regiment) are in good order and complete. A few of the Men are in want of shoes who were absent at the last draught. The Baron Steuben is concerting measures with the officers of the Virginia and Pennsylvania Lines to have their three incomplete companies filled up immediately. Four companies from the Virginia Line to be com-

<sup>5</sup> *Journals of the Continental Congress* (ed. Ford), II. 536.

<sup>6</sup> Order, Headquarters Middlebrook; May 19, 1779.

manded by Maj. Posey; four from the Pennsylvania Line by Lieut. Col. Hay; four from each of the aforesaid Lines by Lieut. Col. Fleury; four companies from the Maryland Line by Maj. John Steward. Lieut. Col. Hay's and Maj. Steward's Battalions to be commanded by Col. Butler and Lt. Col. Fleury's and Maj. Posey's by Col. Febiger.<sup>7</sup>

This body of light infantry is interesting as it was very shortly to distinguish itself at Stony Point. The New England troops and those from New York and New Jersey did not contribute as they were designated for Sullivan's Indian expedition.<sup>8</sup> The next important event in the history of the corps was the assault of Stony Point. As early as February, 1779, General Wayne had asked for a command in the light infantry for the ensuing campaign,<sup>9</sup> and on June 21 he was directed by Washington to report at headquarters at "Smiths in the Clove". Here he was given the mission of taking Stony Point and the command of the light infantry, which corps Washington himself designated for the enterprise.<sup>10</sup> The brilliant assault of the light infantry upon the hostile works, July 15, is well known. The advance of their columns with bayonets fixed and muskets unloaded showed the high state of their discipline and training; they were, in fact, a *corps d'élite*. In September, to assure a high standard of officers, it was directed that the names of captains and subalterns to fill vacancies be prepared by the line colonels of the regiments from which the men were drawn and sent to the commander-in-chief for approval. December 4, the corps disbanded for the winter.

To improve organization for the campaign of 1780 an elaborate plan was prepared by Steuben, approved by Washington, and the necessary orders issued July 16. The corps was now to be on a more permanent and self-sustaining basis; it was to become the model corps of the army.<sup>11</sup> Steuben gave to its organization and training his personal attention. He particularly taught the value of the bayonet as a weapon. The bayonet was not appreciated in the American army, because of the lack of proper training. In his "Easy Plan of Discipline for a Militia", part I., Timothy Pickering had said in 1775 that the Americans were well acquainted with firearms but had little occasion to use the bayonet. Baron Steuben found that the Americans had no faith in this weapon, but he impressed the troops, particularly the light infantry, with its value; and after Stony Point, taking ad-

<sup>7</sup> Report of Inspection of the Light Infantry drawn from the Va., Md., and Pa. Lines, June, 1779. MS. copy of original, Library of Congress, Papers of Continental Congress, Rolls and Returns, XXXI. 61.

<sup>8</sup> H. P. Johnston, *The Storming of Stony Point*, p. 68.

<sup>9</sup> C. J. Stillé, *Major General Anthony Wayne*, p. 169.

<sup>10</sup> *Writings of Washington* (ed. Ford), VII. 487.

<sup>11</sup> F. Kapp, *Life of Steuben*, ch. XIII.

vantage of the impression made by that event, he prevailed upon the commander-in-chief to issue an order that bayonets should in the future be constantly kept fixed, and he took away from the men their bayonet scabbards and belts.<sup>12</sup> The corps of light infantry, according to orders, was to be considered as under the direct orders of the commander-in-chief; its duties were defined and limited. The men furnished were required to be the best in the battalions, middle-sized, active, robust, and "trustworthy"; the first twenty sent by a battalion were, in addition, to be old soldiers; drafts were to be subjected to a careful examination before being received into the corps, and Colonel Scammell, the inspector, reported July 20 that most of the men had been in the corps the year before.<sup>13</sup> Steuben has left complete details of organization at this time, and on July 28, 1780, he was able to write to Washington: "The corps will be the admiration of our allies as much the terror of our enemies. There is hardly a man in it under twenty or over thirty years of age. They are all robust and well made and have a military appearance."<sup>14</sup>

We are able to compare this statement with the inspection report made a few days previous by the assistant inspector general, Alexander Scammell, and we find that Steuben was justified in his enthusiasm. The report covers not only numbers but height, ages, years of service, condition of arms, clothing, etc. The men, according to the inspector, had on an average three or four years' service and were from nineteen to twenty-seven years of age. The report closes with the following remarks:

The whole of the Light Companies appeared Steady under arms, and in general, well proportioned, firm built men, inured to the Field and almost every man of tried Fidelity. The want of cloaths only prevented them making a Complete military appearance. The non-commissioned officers are in general well chosen; the captains and Subs. made a genteel officer-like appearance. Most of the men were in the Light Infantry last year, who belong to the Pennsylvania Line.<sup>15</sup>

A letter from Steuben to Washington, dated West Point, July 22, 1780, written while the Baron was engaged in organizing the corps, brings out an interesting point illustrative of the military system of the time. Referring to the light infantry he said: "Another object before the formation of this corps, is to determine in what order the

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> Inspection Report of the Light Infantry of 5 brigades; July 17, 1780. MS. copy, Library of Congress, Papers of Cont. Cong., Rolls and Returns, XXXIII. 88.

battalions are to be formed in order of battle, to avoid all disputes concerning rank and posts of honor. By the enclosed arrangement, the geographical order adopted in the army will be nearly complied with, etc.”<sup>16</sup>

It would be impossible in this sketch to explain the system followed by the armies of the eighteenth century for forming order of battle; but strictly according to this order, prepared at the opening of every campaign, did the troops march, camp, and fight. It was a vital question, as military honor was involved. Posts of honor, which were, of course, those of the greatest danger, were carefully assigned according to the precedence of organizations. When two allied states formed together the senior took the right; and if the Americans at Yorktown had that post, it was because the French considered themselves auxiliaries and Washington was commander-in-chief. There existed no settled seniority among the Continental regiments, at least at the opening of the war; later we find in the orders numerous boards called to determine the rank of each regiment within its own “line”, that is, with reference to the others in Continental service from the same state. The difficult question, how to arrange in order of battle the troops of the different state lines, was solved by Washington at White Plains, July 26, 1778, as follows: “As it is necessary for sake of regularity that there should be some fixed general Rule for the arranging and disposing in the Line of the army the troops of the different States during the present campaign, they are to take post, so far as circumstances will permit, according to the relative geographical positions of the states to each other, supposing their front to the ocean. This arrangement is not to establish any Point of Honor or Precedency between the troops. All guards and detachments are to parade agreeable to this rule.”<sup>17</sup>

During July the two brigades of light infantry commanded by Generals Poor and Hand were organized into a Light Division under Lafayette, to form the advance corps of the army. Each battalion was now given an adjutant-quartermaster who acted also as the paymaster, a surgeon and mate, a sergeant major and quartermaster sergeant. In the *Journal* of Dr. Thacher, serving in the army at the time, he said that the light infantry “are pronounced to be as excel-

<sup>16</sup> F. Kapp, *loc. cit.*

<sup>17</sup> For the rules of the British army governing the formation of the order of battle, precedence of corps, etc., see Humphrey Bland, *A Treatise of Military Discipline* (London, 1762), p. 297. This book was studied by General Washington, who adopted the British system in the American army. See instructions of Washington to General Parsons, Apr. 3, 1777 (Writings of Washington, ed. Ford, V. 305), and Doniol, *Histoire de la Participation*, IV. 282.

lent a corps as can be produced in any army. The Marquis is delighted with his command and is at his own expense providing for them some extra equipments."<sup>18</sup>

The nature of this extra equipment is given in a life of Lafayette as consisting of flags for the battalions, swords for the officers, and a distinctive black and white plume for the entire corps.<sup>19</sup> Captain McClelland of the Ninth Pennsylvania stated in his diary under date of August 22, 1780: "Each officer of the corps of Light Infantry received an elegant feather, cockade, and epaulets, a present from the Marquis De La Fayette. Each non-commissioned officer received an elegant sword, feather, two bobs, and as much silver lace as would lace the front of their caps, a present from the Marquis De La Fayette."<sup>20</sup>

An order was issued August 29 at Tean Neck announcing that black and red feathers had been furnished to the light infantry as a distinguishing article of uniform.<sup>21</sup> But by far the best description of the light infantry at this period is that given by the Marquis de Chastellux, who visited the corps in November, 1780. The vanguard, he says, consisted,

of light infantry, that is to say the picked corps of the American Army: the regiments in fact which compose it [the army] have no grenadiers but only a company of light infantry, answering to our Chasseurs, and of whom battalions are formed at the beginning of the campaign. This troop made a good appearance, were better clothed than the rest of the army: the uniforms both of the officers and soldiers were smart and military, and each soldier wore a helmet made of hard leather with a crest of horsehair. The officers are armed with espontoons, or rather with half pikes, and the subalterns with fusils; but both were provided with short sabres brought from France and made a present of to them by M. de la Fayette.<sup>22</sup>

Lafayette in his *Memoirs* speaks of the high character of the corps and of its excellent discipline.<sup>23</sup> In October, 1780, the Grand Army was at Orangetown, the "Flying Camp" three miles in front, composed of the light infantry, Parr's riflemen, and Lee's legion. The corps was disbanded for the winter on December 26.

For the next campaign the corps was organized February 1, 1781, earlier in the year than was usual. The following remarks, taken from inspection reports made at the end of February, give an idea of

<sup>18</sup> P. 47.

<sup>19</sup> Charlemagne Tower, *The Marquis de La Fayette*, II. 143-158.

<sup>20</sup> *Pa. Archives*, second ser., XI. 574.

<sup>21</sup> *Legislative History of the General Staff of the Army of the U. S.*, p. 19.

<sup>22</sup> Marquis de Chastellux, *Travels in North America*, I. 104.

<sup>23</sup> *Memoirs of General Lafayette* (London, 1827), I. 252.

the state of the corps. A report by Colonel Scammell dated February 21, 1781, says:

Inspection Rept. of light companies agreeable to a General Order of the 16th Instant . . . a great proportion of the Men added to the light companies in obedience of the above mentioned order are improper for light infantry men. The smallness of the Regiments in general allow of no exchange, although an unusual number of corporals were added, some were rejected; but they could not be replaced—a number without coats.

Another report by Scammell dated February 22, says: "The above companies are composed principally of the men who were in the light infantry last campaign and almost to a man come within the description mentioned in abovementioned order. . . ." Both of these reports give in detail the number of men furnished by the various regiments of the army.<sup>24</sup>

During this year, 1781, Lafayette was sent into Virginia and he took with him three battalions of light infantry, "the best troops that ever took the field". In the following May these were under Muhlenberg, who was serving under Lafayette.<sup>25</sup> It now became necessary to raise light infantry for Washington's army to replace those in the South, and a corps of four hundred men was called for, to be commanded by Colonel Scammell, who was designated as the commander of the light infantry of the army. Dr. Thacher, already quoted, joined this corps and said: "A fine corps of light infantry, selected from the several New England regiments is now formed and put under the immediate command of Colonel Alexander Scammell, formerly our adjutant general. This select corps consisting of the most active and soldierly young men and officers is intended to march in advance of the main army. . . . Col. Scammell was indulged the liberty of choosing his own officers."<sup>26</sup> Alexander Hamilton, a lieutenant-colonel in the staff, now applied for a command in the light infantry and his correspondence with Washington on the subject shows how eagerly such appointments were sought.<sup>27</sup>

At the siege of Yorktown, on October 7, 1781, when the light infantry marched into the trenches for the first time, it is declared that they entered as "with the tread of veterans, colors flying, drums beating, and planted their standards on the parapet".<sup>28</sup> At this siege two important attacks were made. Rochambeau selected his grenadiers and chasseurs, Washington selected the corps of light infantry.

<sup>24</sup> From MS. copy, Library of Congress, Papers of Cont. Cong., Rolls and Returns, XXXI. 69, 70.

<sup>25</sup> H. A. Muhlenberg, *Life of Peter Muhlenberg*, p. 225.

<sup>26</sup> *Journal*, p. 257.

<sup>27</sup> J. C. Hamilton, *Life of Alexander Hamilton*, I. 341-344.

<sup>28</sup> A diary quoted in H. P. Johnston, *The Yorktown Campaign*, p. 135.



It had recently been reorganized into a division, under Lafayette for a second time. This division was assigned the post of honor in the army, the right of the front line. Their attack on the redoubt, like that at Stony Point, was with unloaded muskets and bayonets fixed. Not a shot was fired. Again the light infantry demonstrated their valor. The Viscount de Viomesnil in his report said of the light infantry that they were "like grenadiers, accustomed to difficult things".<sup>29</sup>

In this sketch no attempt has been made to follow the light infantry throughout the Revolutionary War and we shall leave them at Yorktown. Not being a permanent organization, they left no permanent records; representing no particular state, their history has been neglected. Constituting a corps of preference in the American army, like the grenadiers of Europe, they claimed and were given the posts of greatest danger. After Brandywine and Paoli they formed the rear-guard<sup>30</sup> in the retreat. At the siege of Savannah by the allies, the American assaulting column was led by Lieutenant-Colonel Laurens with his battalion of light infantry; and this same battalion did excellent work at the siege of Charleston by the British.<sup>31</sup>

Their striking conduct at Stony Point and Yorktown has been referred to. During periods when the army was in the field but no operations in progress, the light infantry were the advance corps, nearest the enemy, a shield to the army; and a trying rôle it was, involving constant vigilance. The corps of light infantry stands unique to-day, the first and only *corps d'élite* of the American army.<sup>32</sup>

JOHN W. WRIGHT,

*Colonel 5th Infantry, U. S. A.*

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 143.

<sup>30</sup> John Marshall, *Life of George Washington*, III. 141; H. B. Dawson, *Battles of the U. S.*, I. 314.

<sup>31</sup> John Marshall, *op. cit.*, IV. 101; *The Siege of Charleston* (Albany, 1867), p. 79.

<sup>32</sup> The references to the light infantry which are found in the orders of Washington are principally in two sources: the manuscript copies of the original orders, bound into seven volumes, in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress; the original orderly books of various organizations, bound into fifty-four volumes, in the Old Record Office of the Adjutant-General's department.

## RUSSIAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS DURING THE CRIMEAN WAR <sup>1</sup>

WHEN making public speeches the diplomatic representatives of Nicholas I. were wont to dwell on the warm friendship existing between the United States and Russia, but when working in their offices they were at times disheartened to find that this friendship was based almost altogether on antagonism towards England and on self-interest. At such moments they were ready to admit to themselves that a day might come when differences in traditions and institutions would outweigh common hatred, and the bonds that drew the two nations together would weaken. They were, however, determined, as well as instructed, to retain this friendship as long as possible and to do everything in their power to stimulate American self-interest and hatred towards the common foe. Some day, they thought, this policy and this friendship might be helpful. The Crimean War offered the chance to test both.

Just as soon as the struggle began to loom up the Russian Foreign Office wrote to Bodisco <sup>2</sup> to inquire whether in case of war the United States would be neutral and, if so, whether her citizens would be permitted to accept commissions from foreign powers.<sup>3</sup> In other words, would Americans be allowed to fit out privateers to prey on British commerce. Catacazy,<sup>4</sup> the secretary of legation, reported that Marcy, who was diplomatically sounded, seemed to have been unwilling to answer hypothetical questions, but left the impression that America would be neutral.<sup>5</sup> In his own reply Bodisco intimated

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based on material found in the archives of the Russian Foreign Office in 1917. In preparing it the writer had the assistance of one of his students, A. S. Grady. References in the form "Washington, 1854" are references to the cartons so designated in the archives.

<sup>2</sup> Alexander Andreevich Bodisco was born October, 1786, appointed minister to the United States in 1837, and died in Washington Jan. 23, 1854. He seems to have made a good impression on the public men at the capital judging from the speech of Benton on Jan. 24, 1854. *Cong. Globe*, XXVIII. 247.

<sup>3</sup> Washington, 1853. No. 488. Nov. 28. All the dates given are old style unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>4</sup> Constantine Gavrilovich Catacazy was born in 1830 and died in 1890. He came to Washington as secretary of the legation in 1851 and remained five years. He was then transferred to a European post but returned to the United States in 1869 as minister. Three years later he was recalled at the request of the American government.

<sup>5</sup> Washington, 1854. No. 506. Feb. 14/26.

as much, but told his government not to lose hope. He pointed out that if American self-interest were aroused by commercial favors, by permits to import not only the products of their own country but also the merchandise of other neutral lands, a situation might arise that would lead to *d'autres combinaisons*.<sup>6</sup> St. Petersburg accepted the suggestions and advised Bodisco to dangle before the eyes of the Yankee traders the golden opportunity to snatch the Russian markets, now and forever, from the hands of the British shopkeepers.<sup>7</sup>

Before this letter had reached its destination Bodisco had died and the work of the legation fell, at first on Catacazy and later on Stoeckl,<sup>8</sup> zealous and inexperienced men. They came to this country with bags full of European diplomatic tricks and heads crammed with distorted and preconceived ideas about America and Americans. Their experiences and activities are interesting both as to what actually happened and as to what might have happened had their tricks worked. Soon after inheriting the ministerial duties Catacazy proposed a scheme which he thought would surely set the United States against England. He suggested that an American merchantman be engaged to take a cargo of Russian goods to a Russian port through the blockade. The vessel, he said, would be stopped by the enemy, the goods would be confiscated, the Americans would insist on the recognition of their principle that the flag covers the goods, the English would deny it, and before any one knew just what happened these two rivals would be at each others' throats.<sup>9</sup> This idea pleased the Foreign Office and it wrote back to try it, but cautioning not to spend too much money.<sup>10</sup>

While these two letters were crossing each other on the way Stoeckl became chargé d'affaires and began to devise ways and means to bring the United States, either directly or indirectly, on the side of Russia. He very quickly convinced himself that to influence the administration and Congress, even though Webster was in English pay, was rather dangerous and should not be attempted without "la plus grande circonspection". The best way, he thought, was to play on the rivalry of the two English-speaking peoples.

Just at that time there were a number of controversies, such as those over Cuba, Central America, the Sandwich Islands, the fish-

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* No. 84. Dec. 21, 1853.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* No. 71. Jan. 28.

<sup>8</sup> Édouard de Stoeckl was born 1808(?). He first came to the United States in 1849-1850 and spent the next twenty years in this country. For a more detailed sketch of Stoeckl see *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, XXVI. 454-463.

<sup>9</sup> See note 5, *supra*.

<sup>10</sup> Washington, 1854. No. 150. Mar. 13.

eries on the Atlantic coast, and the Oregon Question on the Pacific, to embitter the relations between them. Lord Clarendon's recent speech,<sup>11</sup> which was interpreted to mean that in the future England and France would take a more active part in American affairs than heretofore, not only did not allay this bitterness but tended "to Russify us", as Marcy put it. The President, in complaining of England, said: "We desire most sincerely to remain neutral but God alone knows whether it is possible", and the Secretary of State declared that the United States would defend to the utmost her rights as a neutral to carry on legitimate commerce, that she would not recognize a paper blockade, and would dispatch orders to the squadron then on its way to Japan to go to the Baltic to protect American shipping.<sup>12</sup>

Stoeckl, being a biassed listener, probably magnified these international differences and attached much more importance to these semi-confidential utterances than they really deserved. He became more or less certain that with a little more stirring up of trouble the two commercial rivals would attack each other. With these ideas in his mind he wrote two reports<sup>13</sup> to his government in which he dwelt at some length on the jealousy and bitterness existing between the two Anglo-Saxon states, on the way America constantly insulted and England always apologized, and on the inevitableness of a conflict between them. It will be a battle of giants, he said, the earth will tremble, commerce will be crushed, the world will suffer; but there will be certain gains to civilization, nevertheless. Weakened England will stop meddling in other people's affairs and exhausted America will cease to protect revolutionists and to cause trouble to other states. This test of strength may come to-day, to-morrow, whenever "une occasion favorable pour s'attaquer" presents itself. Who knows but perhaps this European war, with the old quarrel over the rights of neutrals, will be that occasion? Russia must be ever watchful, must never lose an opportunity to fan the flames of hatred. The probabilities are that at the very outbreak of the struggle America will be neutral, not so much because of friendship for Russia as on account of the material advantages to be

<sup>11</sup> Hansard's *Parliamentary Debates*, third ser., CXXX. 43. Jan. 31, 1854. "The Union between the two Governments has not been confined to the Eastern Question. The happy accord and good understanding between France and England have been extended beyond Eastern policy to the policy affecting all parts of the world, and . . . that there is no portion of the two hemispheres with regard to which the policy of the two countries, however heretofore antagonistic, is not now in entire harmony."

<sup>12</sup> Washington, 1854. No. 771. Mar. 10/22.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* No. 523. Jan. 5/17.

gained. The speculators will see in the conflict a chance to enrich themselves and the politicians an opportune moment to grab parts of Mexico and the Sandwich Islands. Under the circumstances Russia's game should be to encourage the Yankees to trade with her, to offer them special inducements in the way of lower tariffs, especially on cotton and colonial goods which have until now been brought in English bottoms. The Americans will go after anything that has enough money in it. They have the ships, they have the men, and they have the daring spirit. The blockading fleet will think twice before firing on the Stars and Stripes. When America was weak she refused to submit to England and now that she is strong she is much less likely to do so.

These reports were warmly received at the Foreign Office. Nesselrode himself acknowledged them and said "les idées qu'ils expriment ont fixé toute l'attention de l'Empereur".<sup>14</sup> Stoeckl was advised to proceed with his plans and to tell the Americans that Russian commerce is theirs for the taking and to announce that on a number of articles the tariff had been greatly reduced.

Before Nesselrode's instructions were even penned Lord Clarendon had notified Buchanan<sup>15</sup> that during this war "The neutral flag shall protect the cargo except in case of contraband, but that the goods of neutrals captured on board an enemy's vessel shall be restored to their owners"; and by the time they had reached Washington an official declaration on this subject had already been made.<sup>16</sup> England's stand on this question as well as on the blockade was all that America could ask. Whether British policy was governed by self-interest, or by the desire to avoid trouble with America, or by the need to harmonize the laws of England and France on the rights of neutrals, need not be discussed here. Enough for our purpose to show that the cunning schemes of Stoeckl were frustrated and that he was forced to find a more direct way of securing privateers.

Russia, as well as her foes, recognized the effectiveness of privateering as a weapon of war. Fear of it sent up the rate of insurance in London and disturbed the world trade of Great Britain.<sup>17</sup> It was not so much because of what the Russians themselves could do as what the Americans would do for them.<sup>18</sup> Marcy, who was supposed to be in the confidence of the Tsar's government, was sounded on the quiet as to the plans of Russia. He replied that he

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* No. 163. Mar. 20.

<sup>15</sup> *Works of James Buchanan*, IX. 165.

<sup>16</sup> Wheaton's *Elements of International Law* (London, 1864), p. 771.

<sup>17</sup> *Works of Buchanan*, IX. 166.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 156.

did not know what she would do but if he were in her place he would fit out every available ship and send it against the enemy's commerce.<sup>19</sup> The Russian diplomat interpreted this answer as a hint of guidance, and the allied representatives as a probable line of action. With the view of discouraging Americans from enlisting under the Russian flag the allies offered to make a treaty with the United States; "the chief object of it was that all captains of privateers and their crews should be considered and punished as pirates, who . . . should cruise against either of the others when belligerent".<sup>20</sup> Marcy would not go beyond the law of 1818 on the subject and expressed himself in rather forcible language on the rights of his countrymen to do what they liked. England gave up privateering altogether<sup>21</sup> in the hope that Russia would, but this one-sided arrangement—for Russia had no ships at sea—did not receive serious consideration.

Stoeckl, new to the service and new to the country, had to feel his way gently. He could not tell whether America would wink at his fitting out corsairs or would catch him in the act and send him home. Marcy's conversation did not enlighten him on this point. The Secretary of State was always expressing his friendship for the Tsar and proving it by repeating what he had told the English minister, that he expected the allies to observe a strict conduct as to neutrals. After puzzling his brain and consulting with men in Washington and New York, Stoeckl concluded that arming privateers in America was risky and that he had better not do it. It was too bad, of course, for the country lacked neither "*la bonne volonté, ni les bâtiments, ni les matelots . . . pour faire ce périlleux métier*". Under the circumstances he put on a pleasant face, made a virtue of necessity, and told the Secretary of State that Russia would observe strict rules as to neutrals and would do nothing to embarrass him. By this policy Stoeckl hoped to capitalize American good-will for use on some future day.

Nesselrode fully approved this attitude and repeated what he had said before, that above all the important thing is to retain the friendship of the United States: "*Cultiver nos excellentes relations avec les États Unis, les faire fructifier dans un commun intérêt et préparer ainsi les voies à une heureuse entente sur les questions que l'avenir peut présenter, c'est à quoi doivent plus que jamais viser dorénavant les soins de la Mission Impériale à Washington.*"<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Washington, 1854. No. 1217. Apr. 19/May 1.

<sup>20</sup> *Works of Buchanan*, IX. 162.

<sup>21</sup> See note 15, *supra*.

<sup>22</sup> Washington, 1854. No. 233. Apr. 10/22.

While Russia was willing to capitalize good-will at some future day, the United States decided to do it now. From almost the very beginning of our diplomatic intercourse with Russia the Department of State had tried to make a treaty covering the rights of neutrals in time of war but had not succeeded. When, however, early in April, 1854, America raised the question anew<sup>23</sup> Russia immediately agreed, merely making a few suggestions but not insisting even on these. Nesselrode did express a wish that the ceremony of ratification should take place at St. Petersburg, but when President Pierce named Washington the Chancellor gave way.<sup>24</sup>

A few months later Marcy inquired how Russia would view the annexation of the Sandwich Islands by the United States, against which England and France had protested. In his reply the Minister of Foreign Affairs said that any act tending to antagonize England and America would not be looked upon with "*mauvais œil*" by his Imperial Majesty. Nothing else mattered, "*ni sous le rapport du droit, ni sous celui des avantages ou inconvénients qu'elle peut nous offrir dans l'avenir*".<sup>25</sup>

In March, 1855, the Secretary of State intimated to the Russian chargé d'affaires that America would like to become a commercial rival of England in Persia. "*Il est de votre intérêt*", added Marcy, "*de nous mettre de plus en plus en contact avec les Anglais.*"<sup>26</sup> What the Russian answer was is not clear but we may assume that it was friendly.

America was not ungrateful, and whenever an opportunity presented itself she was ready to do Russia a good turn. Some time late in March or early in April, 1854, Marcy warned Stoeckl that he knew on good authority that as soon as hostilities should begin the English would either blockade the principal ports or take possession of Alaska.<sup>27</sup> Acting on this information the envoy sent word to the governor of that territory to be ready for eventualities. About the same time that the above conversation took place Stoeckl was spending an evening with Marcy at his home discussing the rights of neutrals. Marcy commented on his interview with the representatives of the allies, who tried to prevent Americans from arming corsairs, and on his reply that citizens of the United States could do anything they liked in foreign ports. This was exactly the information Stoeckl desired. He hurried home and wrote to his gov-

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* No. 1092. Apr. 8/20.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.* No. 1962. July 29/Aug. 10.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.* No. 544. Nov. 4.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.* No. 693. Mar. 7/19, 1855.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.* No. 866. Mar./Apr.



ernment: "Ceci décide la question et le Gouvernement de l'Union n'empêchera pas les Américains de s'armer en corsaires dans nos ports du Pacifique ou ailleurs."<sup>28</sup>

For several weeks Stoeckl had been trying to work out a scheme by which he could engage American privateers and yet not violate American neutrality. According to the law the captain and two-thirds of the crew had to be nationals of the country under the flag of which they sailed, and the vessel itself had to be fitted out in territory of that nation. It occurred to Stoeckl that it might be possible to arrange for Americans to take their vessels to some Russian port in the Pacific, preferably in Alaska, to arm and take out citizenship papers. This procedure he thought would conform to the letter of the law. The next thing to do was to find out how the governments concerned would view his plan. On March 22, 1854, he penned his ideas on the subject and sent them to St. Petersburg.<sup>29</sup> In case they were acceptable he wished to know whether there was any one in the colonies authorized to issue letters of marque and citizenship papers, and whether assurance could be given to the naturalized subjects that they would be protected, treated by the belligerents not as pirates but as prisoners of war, and exchanged for French or English captives.

While the letter was on its way Marcy, as has already been noted, expressed himself on the subject in a manner which cleared the air in that direction. Until word came from St. Petersburg, however, there was nothing better to do than to gather information about ships and men. An inquiry was sent to the Russian American Company's representative at San Francisco to investigate the situation on the Pacific. Other agents reported from different parts of the country. Catacazy was sent to New York to talk to shipowners. Captains of vessels came to the legation to learn where letters of marque could be obtained. A gentleman from Oregon, Simon B. Marye, proposed to drive the "Hudson's Bay Traders" from "Vancouver's Island" if Russia would help the "filibusters"; and "Amicus" offered to go to Europe to enlist the services of Kossuth, Victor Hugo, the Prince de Joinville, John Mitchel, Mazzini, and other liberals to start a world revolution in the name of Nicholas I.

Stoeckl's privateering plot, like his other plan to drag America into the war, died before it saw daylight. The first discouragement came when the belligerents threatened to blockade the Russian possessions in the Northwest; the second when the Americans declined

<sup>28</sup> Washington, 1854. No. 843. Mar. 17/29.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.* No. 775. Mar. 10/22.

to take the risks and asked for material guaranties; the third when a message was received from Russia and a rumor from China by way of California that the Turkish government was offering commissions to Yankees at Constantinople and Peking to raid Alaska. Stoeckl was urged to go at once to Marcy and have him stop any attempts of that kind which would injure American commerce in that part of the world. The *coup de grâce*, however, was Nesselrode's reply, which reached Washington sometime in June. It was polite but firm. The Chancellor pointed out that the proposal did not even meet the outward form of the law. Mere letters of marque were not enough. Naturalization after the declaration of war would be disregarded by the enemy. To make Alaska the base for privateers would bring on the "*actes de vengeance d'un ennemi peu scrupuleux*" and would ruin the Russian American Company. To engage men in America to take service in Alaska was a form of enlistment and against the laws of the United States. It was more than ever necessary that nothing be done to offend our friend. If there were enough venturesome Americans to privateer under the Russian flag they should be given the chargé's blessing. Irregularities might be ignored but the Americans should understand that they were acting on their own risk and responsibility.<sup>30</sup>

Stoeckl was neither easily turned aside nor discouraged. In a letter of July 14 he expressed his satisfaction that his Excellency agreed with him that the privateering scheme should be abandoned. Just the same, it was too bad that there were not a few corsairs to cause an English panic. Perhaps they might yet appear. Of course, as diplomatic agent, he would not take the initiative, but should American adventurers desire to take the risk it would not be for him to stop them. In any case it would be wise to derive some advantage out of the situation by pointing out to the American administration how honestly Russia had lived up to the neutrality laws. Moreover should the English attack Alaska on the pretext that corsairs were being fitted out there, it would be easy to disprove their charges.<sup>31</sup>

For several months Stoeckl had nothing more to say on the question of privateering, but as soon as he heard of the Foreign Enlistment Act<sup>32</sup> before Parliament, he resumed his activities. He called the attention of the Secretary of State to the scrupulous way in which Russia had observed the laws of neutrality and remarked that if England were to be permitted to enlist soldiers for her army,

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.* No. 310. May 26.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.* No. 310. May 26.

<sup>32</sup> Act of Parliament. Dec. 22, 1854.

Russia must be allowed to fit out privateers.<sup>33</sup> Marcy agreed with his reasoning, but cautioned him to be prudent and not to anticipate. Stoeckl proceeded to make plans nevertheless. He advised his government to insert an advertisement in a European journal calling for seamen to join the Russian navy. This notice, he said, would be copied in the papers of the United States and in this way the purpose would be attained and the neutrality law observed. The real question was, who should commission these men. Of course the simplest way would be to send them to one of the Russian ports in the Pacific, but the blockade and the distance made this almost impossible. It might be well to have a special agent in the Sandwich Islands or in South America for that purpose. To be sure, this was a violation of neutrality, but that is no worse than what England and France are doing in that part of the world. For the time being Russia should observe England and do what she does. If England should naturalize enlisted men so should Russia; if she should arm privateers so should Russia. By following in her footsteps, the enlisted men would avoid the risk of being classed as pirates and would therefore be more likely to take the chance. In the conclusion of his letter Stoeckl added that he was collecting information on the situation on the Pacific coast and that he was being aided by Senator Gwin and Beverley C. Sanders, a prominent merchant of San Francisco.

In the letter that followed, written February 5, 1855, Stoeckl reported a conversation with Senator Gwin, who had recently returned from California. The senator gave a glowing picture of the prospects for privateers. San Francisco harbor had the best steamers, the fastest clippers, the most daring sailors, and all that was needed to make use of this material to strike terror into the hearts of the enemy was money to buy the boats and a few Russian officers to command them. Such a fleet could easily maintain itself on its prizes, especially the Australian gold ships. The main outlay would be the initial cost and that would be a mere bagatelle when compared with the harm it would do to the enemy. Of course there might be some difficulty about arming these boats, but that can be left to Russia's friends in California. "*Nous pouvons compter sur le succès*", ended the letter.<sup>34</sup>

On February 22, there was another enthusiastic and urgent appeal. Russia must absolutely make use of corsairs and Russian officers and money must be sent to America at once. Sanders of California had just offered his services and steamers which, if armed,

<sup>33</sup> Washington, 1855. No. 112. Dec. 28, 1854/Jan. 9, 1855.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* No. 308. Jan. 24/Feb. 5.

could sweep the Pacific of every French and English cruiser and every particle of commerce in a very short time.

It must have been towards the end of June or the first part of July, 1855, that the long-awaited reply of Nesselrode came. The Chancellor's polite language could not be misunderstood. Neither the diplomatic mission in America nor any other agent there should issue letters of marque. Nothing should be done that would compromise the good relations with the United States. The only place where armed corsairs could take on "*un caractère quelconque de légalité*" was Eastern Siberia, and any one who wished to take his chance might go there. For the time being, however, the imperial government had decided to give up the idea "*de régulariser au moyen de lettres de marque formelles la coopération des corsaires dans la guerre actuelle*".<sup>35</sup>

Stoeckl's answer to the above is an interesting document, and shows how easily he could put on a pleasant face in an unpleasant situation. He realized, he said, from the very beginning the advantages to be derived from American privateers, without however being blind to the almost insurmountable obstacles in arming these vessels. The Foreign Enlistment Act did remove some of the obstacles but by no means all. On the other hand the attempts of the English to recruit in America and the hot water they got into showed that one could not be too careful. Had Russia followed in their footsteps she too would have been in trouble and would have compromised the good relation between the two countries. Virtue has its own reward. Our observance of the neutrality laws had been quite an asset in supporting protests against the English and in contrasting our "*politique loyale et modérée et celle des Anglais qui sont venus enfreindre ces mêmes lois de neutralité qu'ils avaient invoquées au commencement de la guerre avec tant d'insistance*". We have declined the repeated offers of Americans to fit out privateers because it would be a violation of the laws of the United States. Just recently we showed to Marcy a letter from three hundred Kentucky riflemen who asked to be sent to Sebastopol. Both the Secretary of State and the President have said more than once how much they appreciated the correctness of our conduct. Some day the good-will of the United States will be very valuable for us.<sup>36</sup>

One of the acts of good-will proffered by America to Russia was to play the part of mediator and put an end to the struggle. About July 1, 1854, Marcy broached the subject, leading up to it by

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.* No. 288. May 31.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.* No. 1490. June 30/July 12.

recalling that in times past Russia had tendered a similar service (War of 1812) and that it was only fair that the United States should reciprocate. On July 12 the subject was taken up again. This time Marcy said that the offer of mediation had been discussed and approved by the Cabinet, and that he was working on a plan which he would submit to the belligerents in ten days or two weeks. It was not the purpose of the President, added the Secretary of State, to act as an arbitrator but only as mediator. All parties concerned would be asked to present their demands and after America had examined them and rendered an opinion the belligerents might accept or reject as they saw fit. When Stoeckl raised the point that America's well-known partiality for Russia might cause England to reject the offer, Marcy replied, "Let her do so. It will be one more count against her in our eyes. You surely can not object to that".<sup>87</sup>

Stoeckl and Catacazy suspected ulterior motives and did not quite know what to make of the offer. They were under the impression that the administration was playing politics; that it was trying to win the Irish vote; that it hoped to put England in the position of refusing so that there would be a precedent for refusing any future English offer to intervene in Cuba; and that the President desired to play a part in European affairs. On the other hand they had reason to expect that should the offer be made and accepted their country would not be the loser thereby. They believed that Caleb Cushing, the hater of England, was behind the movement, that the Foreign Relations Committee was friendly, and that a majority of the Senate favored Russia.<sup>88</sup> On the whole the Russian diplomats concluded that it might be worth trying, and passed on that impression to their government.

On August 8, Marcy told Stoeckl that after thinking over the matter the President had concluded that for the time being he had better not push the offer. Austria and Prussia were trying to bring the belligerents together and it would do more harm than good to have too many people in the affair. Then again the United States was negotiating with England and France on a number of questions and it would not be admissible to offer to mediate at the same time. However, should Austria and Prussia fail in their efforts, America would step in and tender her services.<sup>89</sup>

This change of front caused Stoeckl to belittle the administration. All that it wanted, he wrote, was to play local politics, and to get the prestige of having meddled in European affairs. America

<sup>87</sup> Washington, 1855. Nos. 1370, 1779. July 2/14.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.* No. 1963. July 29/Aug. 10.

had meddled too much already in the Old World; she had protected the revolutionists of 1848 until now they regarded her with great admiration. It would not do to have the United States play too important a rôle. If America seemed friendly to Russia it was not because she liked her, but because she disliked the Anglo-French alliance. It was possible, of course, that the President might make the offer later, but it was not wise to count on it too much.

As Prussia and Austria grew colder towards Russia Stoeckl began to warm to America. When, about the middle of September, Marcy explained to him that Austria's activities and her attitude towards the United States made it more and more necessary to postpone mediation, he had to agree that the offer had something more to it than politics.

Early in October came Nesselrode's reply to Marcy's query as to how Russia would view mediation.<sup>40</sup> Without accepting or rejecting it but clearly intimating what he had in mind, the Chancellor pointed out that although Russia fully believed in the impartiality of America, the enemy was somewhat in doubt on the point. The very fact that the United States planned such a move had already aroused the suspicion of the allies. Should Russia accept, with the proper warmth, her enemies would at once interpret it as a confession of weakness. Under the circumstances it would not be very dignified for the imperial Cabinet to express itself on the subject. Every time Russia made one concession her enemies asked for two more. Whether the United States should make the offer depended largely on the encouragement she received from England and France. There was no question but that the belligerents needed peace and the neutrals a restoration of their commercial life, and therefore anything the United States could do to put an end to the misery and suffering would earn her the gratitude of humanity and give her a high place as a moral leader.

From the end of 1854 and all during the year 1855 the question of mediation was the subject of interesting discussion at the capital. The President, the Secretary of State, representatives and senators, among them Clingman, Clayton, Mason, and Sumner, were in favor of the offer and worked for it.<sup>41</sup> Against it were also prominent men and the representatives of England and France. None of the belligerents was willing to come out in the open and as a result the

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.* No. 483. Sept. 10.

<sup>41</sup> Resolution of Thomas L. Clingman in the House of Representatives on Dec. 11, 1854 (*Cong. Globe*, XXX. 76); resolution of Charles Sumner in the Senate on Dec. 21, 1854 (*Senate Journal*, 33d Cong., 2d sess., p. 63).

question dragged on until the war came to end by direct negotiations between the belligerents.

Before the struggle was quite over Stoeckl managed to commit one breach of neutrality and escape the consequences. At some time during the conflict the Russian government placed an order for a steamboat in New York. Though its owners were supposed to be Americans no one was deceived, not even Marcy, who was ready to overlook, in the case of Russia, the violation of the spirit of the law provided the letter of it was observed. When the boat was completed and named *America* it hoisted the Stars and Stripes and sailed for the Pacific by way of Cape Horn. On the way it put in at Rio Janeiro and while there an English warship threatened to seize it as a Russian vessel and would probably have done so had not the American naval officer come to the rescue. This incident caused the Department of State to ask the chargé for particulars. Stoeckl admitted the facts but claimed that no irregularities had been committed. Marcy was satisfied and added: "If the English push us too hard we will tell them frankly that it ill becomes them who have received so much help from American citizens to complain because the Russians had a steamer built in this country."<sup>42</sup>

As the bloody war proceeded one European state after another left the neutral column and went over to the side of the Tsar's enemies. By the time it was over the United States was the only nation in the world that was neither ashamed nor afraid to acknowledge boldly her friendship for Russia. This friendship manifested itself in various ways and when the Russians counted up the numerous favors they had received they were both proud and pleased at the long list:

1. America had forced England to accept the principle that the flag covers the goods, and helped Russian commerce;
2. America permitted the sale of the Russian merchant marine interned in her ports after the declaration of war;
3. American naval vessels rescued the crew of the Russian ship *Diana* in the Far East;
4. America put a stop to recruiting for the English army;
5. America protected the S. S. *America* at Rio Janeiro;
6. American prestige and the fear of America prevented the allies from accepting the Spanish terms (guaranteeing Cuba) and consequently the Spanish help against Russia.

There are Russians who even believe that had not England humiliated herself, had she not backed down on every issue, America

<sup>42</sup> Washington, 1856. No. 2217. Oct. 11/23.



would have taken up arms.<sup>43</sup> Whether this interpretation of American friendship and Anglo-American relations is correct is of less importance than the fact that the Russians believed it and acted on it. On different occasions Nicholas I. and Alexander II. sent their thanks to President Pierce, Secretary Marcy, and Attorney General Cushing for encouraging words and kindly deeds. When Spain offered to join the coalition the imperial Cabinet let it be known that its former defense of Spain was all a mistake and that from now on any policy pursued by America towards that country would meet with no opposition from Russia. When the United States could not accept the Declaration of Paris, Russia refused to join the other powers in urging her to do so. When the Congress of Paris was over the Chancellor sent word that the Emperor fully agreed with Marcy and that at any time that the question should come up before an international conference Russia would support it. Moreover, in so far as Russia and the United States were concerned, the Declaration of Paris did not exist:

Si en cas de guerre entre les États-Unis et Une Puissance tierce, un corsaire Américain légalement armé se présentera devant un port Russe, il sera admis chez nous. La Déclaration de Paris nous laisse en cela une entière latitude. Nous ne nous sommes pas engagés à maintenir le principe de l'abolition de la course contre ceux qui n'y accéderaient pas. Veuillez le dire à Mr. Marcy.<sup>44</sup>

Soon after the conclusion of peace American merchants made inquiries as to the chances of trade on the Amur and on Saghalin Island. Gorchakov replied that although for international reasons no American consul could for the time being be admitted, yet Stoeckl was to tell the Americans confidentially that should they go they would find a warm welcome, that special facilities would be given them, and that secret orders to that effect had been issued.<sup>45</sup>

When in 1857 Chinese affairs occupied the minds of statesmen Russia made it quite clear where she stood: "L'Empereur désire marcher d'accord avec le Gouv't Américain dans cette question comme dans toutes celles qui se rattachent aux destinées des États-Unis." Two months later came another letter on this question: "Si la suite des événemens porterait ce dernier [U. S.] à désirer qu' une entente directe s'établisse dans le sens d'une action pacifique combinée entre notre envoyé et ses autorités dans les mers de la Chine, l' Amiral Poutiatine reçoit dès aujourd'hui l'ordre de s'y prêter avec empresse-

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.* No. 1305. June 10/22. Washington, 1855. No. 2138. Oct. 20/Nov. 1.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.* No. 293. July 21.

<sup>45</sup> Gorchakov to Stoeckl, dated Moscow, Sept. 21, 1856. No number.

ment." In May and June, 1857, England and France asked Russia to co-operate with them in China and the Tsar's answers were always guided by the idea of *marcher d'accord* with the United States. In July President Buchanan and Secretary of State Cass expressed their great satisfaction that the imperial Cabinet "a accédé dans toute leur étendue aux vœux que lui a exprimés le Cab't de Washington".<sup>46</sup>

During the Civil War the rôle of the two nations was reversed. It was now Russia's turn to give moral support to the United States. When in the course of commercial and territorial expansion the Russians and Americans met in the Pacific and misunderstandings began to arise, the Tsar, rather than lose the friendship of the United States, sold Alaska. That in helping each other the two states were indirectly serving their own interests does not in the least detract from the fine spirit of friendship that animated them. The Russians were more eager than the Americans to preserve this friendship and there was some question about proposing an alliance, but after thinking it over Russian statesmen came to the conclusion that mutual interest, honest and straightforward dealing, avoidance of causes of quarrel, would do more to bring the two peoples together than a union "qui nous lierait trop étroitement".<sup>47</sup>

FRANK A. GOLDER.

<sup>46</sup> Washington, 1857. No. 110, Feb. 12; No. 306, Apr. 20; No. 365, May 20; No. 438, June 1; No. 475, June 19/July 1.

<sup>47</sup> See note 43, *supra*.

## DOCUMENTS

### 1. *A Confederate Private at Fort Donelson, 1862.*

THE private soldier is not in a position to judge of the general conduct or course of battle or siege, yet his narrative often has value, of its own sort. The following account of the defense of Fort Donelson and of the experiences of Confederate soldiers who were made prisoners by its surrender shows phases of Civil War history seen from the point of view of the individual campaigner, and as such has its interest. For the opportunity to print it we are indebted to Mr. Walter F. Meier, of Seattle, who writes as follows:

"During a recent visit to relatives in Kentucky, the writer came into possession of an account of certain events occurring during the Civil War written by his great-uncle, 'Spot' F. Terrell, who was a member of the 49th Tennessee Volunteer Regiment of the Confederate Army. The account commences with the attack on Fort Donelson in February, 1862, and covers the assaults made upon the fort, its surrender, the transportation of prisoners to Chicago and their return down the Mississippi to Vicksburg, where the contingent of which Mr. Terrell was a member was reorganized under the conscript law. I have faithfully transcribed this account, adhering strictly to the spelling and sentence structure, save that I have supplied periods at the ends of sentences and substituted capital letters at the beginning of each sentence instead of retaining the small letter that usually occurred."

FORT DONELSON, February 1862.

The Battle of Donelson commenced Tuesday the 11th of february. Skirmishing by the pickits little or no damage done. On thursday the 13th the Ball opened heavy fighting all along our lines. Also an attack on the front and river Batterys by the gun boats, heavy firing on both sides. Our loss in that ingagement was one man kild at the battrey one in the fort. Captain dickson the cheaf engineer<sup>1</sup> fel at his post at the battery. One wounded at the battrey and one kild in the fort and 2 wounded. The federils was repulst that day. friday 14th. Early in the morning the Ennimy made an attack on our Senter. There was heavy firing by musketry and artilrey. The ingagement lasted purty well all day by the infntry. The canonading was kept up until dusk. In the morning the gunboats made an attack on the fort. The ingagement in the morning onley lasted a short time. About too oclock in the evening the gunboats came up from behind the Bend and opened fire on our Battreys. Our

<sup>1</sup> Lieut. Joseph Dixon, local engineer officer.

Batery Belcht fort their loud and stidealy Thundring in ancier to thears. The gunboats with full Determination to take our Batery by Storme came forth with six of thear gunboats. Tha prest up the river stidley firing upon us and our Battreys while the Bum shells were bursting in the air with loud and wild confusion threatning sudden death and distrucktion. Stil tha came onn. While our one hundred and twenty eight pounder and our Riful Sixty four were threatning them with suden distrucktion and also while five thirty two pounders were hailing down on them with a vengeance<sup>2</sup> the boats came within Three Hundred yards of the Batterrys and tha turnd loosed their guns with grap shot to run our guners away from thear Guns but tha finding our men to hard and brave for them, tha concluded to givit up and tha turnd down the River While the Iron and Wood was flying from them upin the air tha sneaked down behind the bend badly tore to peasis. We reciivd little or no damage from the gunboats. On friday our little army in the field repulst the enemy at Evrey point. With a heavy loss to them. Our loss was none in comparison to thears. Now Knight came onn when thear was Silents in the field and fort. Our men was ingaged that Knight in throing up Earth work around our batery as if evrey Moment was the last all for our Security. The Cold North Wind was blowing and cutting our years and fingers. We suffered a great deal from the Sevear cold and Snow that lay spread over the ground. Saturday the 15th came on Stil cold in the morning but melting for that by the time the son was shooting forth her butiful rays upon the tree tops. The Enemy came in on our Extreme left wing hott and heavy but Gin. Floyd being at the right place he welcumbd them in with his Brite artilrey and Shining Musketts. The batl opend with loud roring of canon and hot and heavy musketry. The federrels fought Gineril Floyd with an odd of five to one stil our brave boys drove them back from the beginning. The battle lasted on our left wing until about two o'clock in the eavning. Then the federrils turned to our right wing with Seventy Thousand well drild Soldiers with a determination to take the fort by Storm while our right wing was but purley protected by our troops oing to the hard fiting on the left. Gineril Buckenor being in command on the Right about half past too in the eavning with a large forse and Buckenor not beaing at his post<sup>3</sup> tha marchd up the hill and over felen timber in to our riful pits without much difaculty. The fourty ninth and fiftieth Regments was then orderd out to the Battle ground from the fort while reinforcements was sent from all along the line too. We wear out to Battle ground when the fourty ninth reacht the ground. Thears was but a part of too regments contending against a supuir forse. There was a part of the thirtieth, Tenn. and 2 Kentucky Regt. Tha was soon reinforst suffisient to hold the blue coats in check while the brave lovers of thear Country and fambly pord into the heart of the Enemy thear deathly bloys. The fite continued about two ours with loud and terriffick firing, the Enemy finding the brave Tennesseans and Kentuckians to hard for them. Tha Tuck to thear heels

<sup>2</sup> Col. J. E. Bailey, commanding the 49th Tennessee Infantry, the diarist's regiment, says in his report (*Official Records*, first ser., VII. 391), "The batteries near the river mounted one 68-pounder rifle, one 10-inch columbiad, . . . and eight 32-pounders". Captain Culbertson (p. 392) reports similarly. But Lieut.-Colonel Haynes, chief of artillery (p. 410), speaks of "the rifled gun, throwing a conical shell of 128 pounds".

<sup>3</sup> By reason of orders from General Pillow. *Official Records*, VII. 282.

at a dubble quick over the hill and out of sight and then our Regiment was ordered Back to the fort as we expectd the gunboats would make an attack on the fort. Tha hove up from behind the bend and fierd a few Shots at long rang and our baterrys opend on them in return but without affect on Eather side. Soon Knight came on and the gunboats dropped down below the bend and the firing seasd in every direction. Evrey thing was in purfect silents and tranquil once more. Our brave Countreymen returnd to thear qartes Cheerd up with the hope of a Nother Glouris victory the next morning. But to our great surprise our commander in cheefe finding out the strength of the Enimey and ther onley Reinforcements he deamed it nessarey to surrender his command up in to the hands of the Enimy, and owing to the wornout condision of his men oing to the sevear cold snow and heavy frost that lay spred over the ground and a great many of our men sevearley frost bit oing to thear long continuation in the ditches and behind the riful pits. Not only did he deem it nessary to surrender his men only but him Self also and for the well fare of his men. On the morning of the Sixteenth about one oclock it had bin detirmined by the commanding officers to cut our way out through the Enimeys line and distroying all of the army stores and retreat by the way of Nashvill. For this purpose Scouts was sent out for the purpos of exsaming the Road and to assurtain whether the Enimy ocupied the ground tha had bin driven from the day previous or not and Some of forrists men was then orderd to inspect a sloug about a mile from dover. Tha soon returnd and reported that the Roads was purfectly coverd with yankeys and thear campfiers was burning in evrey direction also that the slough was impasible for infintry.<sup>4</sup> This information prodused a change of opperrations and then a confurance tuck place at whitch was presant Ginerl floyd Pillow Buckenor Col. Forist Jones Gilmir Henrey Hanes and bush Rod Johnson and Lieut Martin and Nickoldson the two last being aids of Ginerril Pillow.<sup>5</sup> Notwithstanding that communications had bin cut off, Gin. Pillow urged the nesesity of cutting our way out or make a fite for another day in whitch he thought that we could get steamboats enouf to convey the hold command across the River and make our escape by the way of Clarksville.

Gin. Buckenor then sed from the wornout and distrest condision of his men, and the occupation of the riful pits by the Enimy on the right he could not hold his posission for a half a hour if atackded by the Enimy at daylight whitch he sertainly would do. Gin Pillow replide why cant you, I think you can Sir, and addid that ocupation of our Riful pits on the right by the Enimy left an open gateway to our river baterrys and he thought that we ought to cut our way out at all hazard.

Gin Buckenor retorted saing I no my posission. I can onley bring to bare aganst the Enimy 4000 men while he can oppose me eny given number. Pillow then sed Gentlemen what do you intend to do I am in favor of fiting out. Flloyd then asked Buckenor what he had to say.

<sup>4</sup> Forrest's report says (*ibid.*, VII. 386), "I . . . sent out two men, who, going by a road up the bank of the river, returned without seeing any of the enemy, only fires, which I believed to be the old camp fires, and so stated to the generals; the wind, being very high, had fanned them into a blaze". *Per contra*, Major G. A. Henry, *ibid.*, p. 296.

<sup>5</sup> Lieut.-Colonel Gilmer says (*ibid.*, p. 264) that he was not present, though Major Haynes and Lieutenant Nicholson say that he was (pp. 297, 299); General Bushrod Johnson was not (p. 363).

Buckenor replide that to attempt to cut our way out through the linds would cost a sacrifice of two thirds of the command and that no Gin had the rite to make Such a Sacrifice of human lifes. Floyd admitted the fact and concured with Bucknor on this point. Pillow then replide that thear was but one alternative and that was cappitulation and address him Self to floid and Sed I shal neather surrender my Self nor the command ading you know my relation with the federil Government and it would not do alluding to his corse when Seckutary of war in distributing to the South her qoto of armis. Buckenor replide that he thought no personal feelings ought to controle official acttion. Floide admitted it and sed never the less it was his determination. Buckenor sed then Gentlemen I supose that the Surrender wil fall upon me. Floid addressing him Self to Buckenor sed Gin if you ar put in command wil you allow me to take out my brigade. Buckenor sed yes if you wil take out your command before I send my offer of cappitulation to the Enimy.<sup>6</sup> Then Sed floid I wil Surrender the command. Pillow upon whom the command next devolved sed I wil not except it as my purpose is fixt never to surrender. Buckenor amediately replide I will except it and shear the fate of my command and at once cald for pen ink and paper and a burgler to sound a parley—it being two dark to send a flag of Truce.

Pillow then asked if it would be proper for him to make his escape to whitch floyd said that is a qestion for evrey man to decide for him Self but he would be glad that Evrey man could make his escape if he could. Col. Forrist adrest him Self to Gin Buckenor and Sed I think theare is more fite in our men that you think for but if you wil let me I wil take out my command—to whitch Buckenor and Floyd both concented. Turning to Pillow and sed Gineril I fought under your command what shal I do? Pillow ancierd cut your way out to whitch forrist replide I will by G.D. About too oclock we wear orderd on to march. We marcht over to dover, through the mud and water for it was verry muddy. We found that we wear surrenderd up in to the hands of the Enimy. We turnd and marcht back to the fort. By this time day was braking. As soon as good lite we saw seven white flags waving over the fort. Theare was sadness amonkesd our men throughtout the intire incampment for it was hart rending thing to think after so meney glowing vicktoreys to have to surrender up the fort and ourselves. But we had to content ourselves as best we could under the circumstances. But early in the morn-ing the son shone out her butiful rays up on our furlone condishion whilst stalking about our qarters not noing what was to become of us. The Enimey did not no that we had surrenderd. Earley in the morning one of the Gunboats came up from behind the bend and pord thear Shotts before she saw the flag of Surrender but as soon as she saw the white flag she seast firing and then then thear was loud Shouts all over the woods from the yankeys for tha had us completely surrounted. About 12 oclock tha marchd into our qarters by thousands with thear musick. Tha drove us into our qarters and would not let us Go out that butiful Sabbath day. The day passd off in Sorrow and Sadness. Knight came on and we wear marcht over to dover and down the River Bank onto a

<sup>6</sup> "Before the enemy receives my proposition for capitulation", according to Major Henry (p. 297); "before the enemy act on my communication", according to Pillow and Haynes (pp. 288, 298); "before his note was sent to Grant", according to Colonel Burch (p. 294); "before the terms of capitulation are agreed on", according to Lieutenant Nicholson (p. 300).



Steam boat. The 49th Tenn was stowed upon the herricane. It pord down rain all nite long. The 50th was stowd on deck crouded as thick as we could stick. Theare was about seven hundred men on bord of the old Jennary.<sup>7</sup> Monday morning the 17th came on. We wear stil at dover and their was presented to our senerey about Sixty Steamboats and Gunboats. Evreything seamed to be in a stir and crouding multi-tudes wear crouding the River Banks. About 2 o'clock we left dover for Chicago. We reacht caro the morning of the 18th about eight oclock and thear I saw nothing but federils bound for donelson but we mist Severil Steamboats loaded with Soldiers, before we reacht Caro. The old Jennary landed at Caro and putt off Severil hundred Bushils of potatoes. When She left Caro She turnd up the Mississippi River. We new not whear but went on. Wedsday the 19 the day past off and we stil went up the river pasing a Great meney towns and city. We past St. Louis in the knight. Thursday the 20 came onn. About ten oclock we reacht Alton illinois and thear we wear tacon off of the Boat and marcht out throug town and crambd in the cares so thick that we could hardley turn around. About 2 oclock we started for Chicago about 290 miles pasing meney towns—the first, Bright[on], Shipman, Garland, Virgene,<sup>8</sup> Auburn, Springfield, Lincoln, Blumington, Bolington, Gollity,<sup>9</sup> Lockport, Athens, Burvill, Ginivill, Williams Springs,<sup>10</sup> Chicago. We reacht Chicago friday morning about ten oclock. The weather was verry cold. The ground was coverd with ice. We marcht from the cares about one mile throug a part of the city to our place of imprisement. The gate of camp Douglas was thrown open to receave the capttured Rebbles. The federrils croudded around to welcum us in. We wear soon furnished with good qarters. The next thing was a Recusion for somthing to eat for we wear verry hungrey. We wear soon visittid by the citisons of the Sitty men and women. Some seam to Simpathise with us and others seamed to think that it was all rite for us to be hear. Soon after our arrival at this place after pasing Throug meney Exposures from the Time we left for donelson thear was meny of the Prisenors Tacon Sick and Sent off To the Hospittall. Theare was a good meney of the 49th tacon sick and severil deaths of Co. F. Thursday G. W. Blanton died March 28, 1862. E. C. Smith March 1st, /62. W. R. Holt March 6th. T. H. Steavens March 10th. E. G. Deupree March 16th. Died in Co. E 49th. M. D. Powel March 5th, D. R. Ginitt March 16th. Albert Powel April 21st, Elias Powers March 4th. After beaing thear for several days the Secesh begin to visit us verry ofton bringing us tobaco and pipes to smoke. A great meney of them brought clothing and give to the boys of verious kinds but that did not last long. The federils hoo was in command at this place finding that our friends from the city was of some benefit to us Rebbles Col Muligan hoo was in command put a stop to our friends from coming in to comfort thear sore distrest friends.<sup>11</sup> Once and a while he would let one or too to come in to see thear friends and acqantances. The Col would let his friends from the city those blackharted abilision, yes he would let them Scoundrels to come in and

<sup>7</sup> The *D. A. January*; *Official Records*, second ser., III. 277. Five thousand of the prisoners taken at Fort Donelson were sent to Chicago; *ibid.*, pp. 281, 291.

<sup>8</sup> Carlinville, Virden.

<sup>9</sup> Joliet.

<sup>10</sup> Willow Springs.

<sup>11</sup> Under orders from the commissary general of prisoners.



point and sneer at the Rebbles. Thear was old Brownlow<sup>12</sup> that came to camp douglas in april about the 10th and made a speach for the abilishian party in chicago. He got up and went on to sympathise with the Tennesseens. Sed that we wear godd in to the Rebelian by our leaders. He sed that tha aut all to be hung and would be if ever we git them. He went on to say that the stares and Stripes must and should wave all over Tennessee over evrey town and hill in Tenn. At that time the Battle of pitsburge had just bin fought and it was reported that Beaureguard had bin wounded. He said that he wisht that the ball that struck him had went through his heart in the place of his arm.

Mr Brounlow a citizen of Tenn making abolision speaches for the North. We did not thank him for his pitaful talk and old Blackharted Scoundrel. A few days after Brownlow mad a speach thear was a Mr. Hendrick from Nashville Tenn came in to our prison and made a speech pretending in the behalf of the Tenn and the 18th of april he preacht a sirrman at whitich I was presant. This Hendricks is a son of old H. Hendricks of Clarksville. We wear visittid by a good meny of our old friends from Tenn. Col Stocker was at camp douglas on the 7th and 8th of July/62. He was not permitted to see meny of the priseners but we wear glad to know that he was ————— for we Sent a good meny.

Just befor Stocker parson Reynolds was hear just from Sandusky city. He had bin thear to see his brother in law. He came hear for the purpose of seaing his brother. We wear all glad to see him. We sent letters to our friends by him. On the 25th of July Mr. W. P. Nicholds and Sam Woldreg from dickson County Tenn was admitted in the prison. We sent letters by them to our friends. On the 11th of August the oath was offerd and Severil Hundred purtisioned for to take the oath of alleagance to The United Stats. August the 30th M. J. Pace died between Twelve and one oclock at knight. He was a Member of Co F 49th Tenn. Regt. He requested his funrel to be preacht from the fourth chapter of the second Timitha the 6, 7, 8th vurses and by Preacher Low or parson Burney of Cheatam county, Tenn. August the 27th Mr. Cambell of Tenn made a speach in Camp douglas in behalf of the Tenn priseners requested them to take the oath of alleagance to the united states and return to thear alleagance to the federril Government. Thear was severil hundred that tacon the oath. Thear was 43 in the 49th Regiment that tacon the oath. On the third of September we wear orderd to cook up 4 days rations and pack up to leave for vicksburge.<sup>13</sup> We left old camp douglas on the ————— three oclock in the eavning. While we wear in line ready to march out of prison it rained verry hard. The most of us got verry wet. Soon after the rain we was marcht out to the cares. Soon we wear on the cares and started for Caro. After leaving Chicago we past Calument. The next Materson 24 miles from Chicago. Manteno 40 miles, Kankee 56 miles. Sept the 6th past Mettoon 200 miles from Caro. Nego 180 mil. Ethington Farrina<sup>14</sup> 143 miles. About 12 oclock the Locomotive and five cares run off of the Track. Kild one man and

<sup>12</sup> W. G. Brownlow ("Parson Brownlow"), who had been sent inside the Union lines at Nashville March 3.

<sup>13</sup> The instructions for the transfer of prisoners from Camp Douglas to Vicksburg, subject to future exchange, are in *Official Records*, second ser., IV. 420.

<sup>14</sup> Matteson, Manteno, Kankakee, Mattoon, Cairo, Neoga, Effingham, Farina.

wounded Ten others. We was detained about four hours. Tha soon repaired the Track and brout up a new Locomotive and hitchd onto the Train and run down to Santralia.<sup>15</sup> We ran to Caro that night. We reacht caro about 2 hours before day light. As soon day come we was marcht from the cares to the Steamboat and about Six hundred crambd on one Boat. We lay at caro about three days ankrd out in the middle of the river. We left Caro on the Eavning of the 8th about two oclock. Theare was in the fleet nine transports and one gunboat bound down the Mississippi River to Vicksburg all loded with Rebbles. On the same day past Collumbus 25 miles below in the Kentucky side and then Hickman 50 miles. The 9th past Island no Ten in the morning. Saw Some federril Caverly at this place. Ran on that day at Knight lay up. Sept. 10, Landed at Memphis in the morning. Loaded on coal all day. We wear cheard hartily by the Ladys of Memphis. Tha crouded the River Bank and cheard the confederate Soldiers all day. The 11th came on We wear stil at Mempas. Our boat ran to Shore. Multitudes of wimmin crouded around and hallowd for Jeff Davis and the South. Tha give meny Gifts of tobaco apples and peaches candy and all sorts of grappess. The boys gave them Rings in return which was verry acceptable with the Tenn Girles. About 3 oclock we left Memphis. Theare was about Six Thousand federrils at this place and one Gunboat. Sept. the 12th we landed at Hellena about 90 miles below Mempas. We lay thear about 24 hours. The boat that I was on unloaded frait all knight under a flag of truce. Theare was at this place about 15 thousand federrils Severril Gunboats and Transports at the place. We left thear the 13th. The Eavning ran ten miles below Hellena past some federrils campd on the River Bank about six hundred Strong. We ran 60 mile and lay up for the knight. 14th Sept past Napolian, in arcancas at the Mouth of Arkinsaw river 125 miles below Memphas. Theare was no troops at this place. Sept 15th we laid up 70 miles above vicksburg. Berrid Severril of our men that died on the differnt boats. We met with Severril boats that had bin down to Vicksburge with priseners. We started out and ran to the mouth of the Yaszou river and stopt Sept 16th. The confederate Steamboat came up and receivd our officers and tacon them down to the city. Sept 17th we was orderd ashore. We wear cold and one at a time and we marcht across the point to the city about two miles. We reacht the city about sundon. We met our officers and was carried to Good qarters. Our fare was tollerable ruff while we wear in vicksburg. The citisons wear not prepared for the receiption of so meney conciqintaly we got but little to eat. In the city evrething was so verry high. We could not by much as our money was so verry scearce. Flour was seling at fifty dollars per Barril. Eggs a dollor a dos. Butter one dollor. Ginger cakes 50 cts a peace. We staid hear two days and then we was orderd to Clinton Miss. On the 19th we got abord of the cares and rold out for Clinton. We reacht Clinton about six oclock in the eavning. We then marcht about one mile north of clinton and struck camps. After a good knight rest we rose up in the morning of the 20th refresht. A butifol morning it was. We drew our camp equipage on that day. On the 21st I visitted the town of clinton. This was Sunday a nise day. I went into the hospitals to se the sick soldiers. Tha seamed to be well cared for. I saw some peacas for Sale. Tha wear worth 25cts per dosen. Water melons was seling for one dollor a peace.

<sup>15</sup> Centralia.

Brandy Selling for thirty dollors a gal. Shoes was worth from fifteen to 20 dollors a pair. Evreything is very scearse at this place in the way of vegatibles. There is plenty of Sweet potatoes but verry high. Tha Sel for three dolors per Bushil. No cabage in this country. On the 23rd it rained verry hard and our tents was not suffichent to keep us dry as we had nothing but some flyes for tents. 14th stil cloudy. Severril of our boys tacon sick and sent to the hospital at clinton. Tha had bin verry much exposed from the time we left camp douglas. The 26th after eating a harty breakfast of biscuits and Texas beef I tacon a tramp out in the country Grape hunting. Found some verry nice grapes. At this time we are living on pickil pork and some beef flour and meal. Sept 27 the Regimint was reorganised under the concript law for two years longer. Electted our company officers. All men under the concript law is held from the age of eight year to forty five. All under and over releast. Sept 28th, Sunday nothing adoin. I went out and got some grapes for amusement. The 29th we commencid drilling. Oct 1st we had Preaching by a citison of Mississippi. Oct 6th Capt Roberts and Lieut Rudolph, Powel and Harimon, Johnson Started for Home. Resignd their office. We Sent a good meney letters by them to our friends. On the same day our qarter master Dan Gold and his Brother and Capt Atkins came to the Regt. On the Eight we electted our field officers. Electted Bailey<sup>16</sup> for Col for Liut Col Grigsby Major D A. Lynn.

## 2. *Three Manuscripts of Gideon Welles.*

WITH the fifteen manuscript volumes of the diary of Gideon Welles in the Library of Congress there are three other manuscript volumes in Mr. Welles's handwriting. The first is labelled "Narrative". It is a relation of events from the beginning of the Lincoln administration to June 29, 1861, when a council of war was held at the Executive Mansion to discuss General McDowell's plan of campaign. The second, the one here printed, is labelled "Narrative of Events". This consists of only twenty-four pages. In it Mr. Welles was concerned with two political problems, the appointment of Messrs. Seward, Chase, and Cameron to the Cabinet, and the circumstances surrounding the retirement of Mr. Cameron and the selection of Mr. Stanton. His account is useful in supplementing the rather casual treatment in his diary and affords more light on these very perplexing matters. The third volume is labelled "Narrative of Events Commencing March 6, 1861". A part of this appears in the first volume of the printed diary under the title "The Beginning of the War". It is reasonably certain, however, that Mr. Welles in writing the manuscript did not intend it to be introductory to the diary which begins in August, 1862, for he writes of many things which are also recorded in his daily notations in the diary. In the omitted portion of this third narrative, which is about one-

<sup>16</sup> James E. Bailey, who had been their colonel up to the time of the surrender, and had since been a prisoner in Fort Warren.

third of the whole document, Mr. Welles discusses the Stanton-McClellan controversy, a dispute over the exchange of prisoners in 1864, the happenings surrounding the death of President Lincoln, and finally, gives a long and sharp criticism of Mr. Stanton and his actions during President Johnson's administration. Similar accounts are given in the diary. However, a great many of the important events of the war are passed over completely. Neither Captain Wilkes nor the Trent Affair is mentioned, though of great concern to the Navy Department.

These three manuscript volumes, as in the case of the manuscript of the diary, were carefully worked over and revised by Gideon Welles, some things stricken out, emendations made, and passages inserted. Internal evidence indicates that all of the narratives were written after he left the Cabinet. A statement written in the "Narrative of Events Commencing March 6, 1861", but omitted in "The Beginning of the War", gives a little more definite idea of the time of its writing. Prefacing his discussion of Secretary Stanton, as found in the printed text (*Diary*, I. 54), he wrote: "Edwin M. Stanton, late Secretary of War, and recently appointed Judge of the Supreme Court, died on the 26th of December, 1869."

It is also quite apparent in the three volumes that Mr. Welles's views and feelings were colored by his gradually increasing animosities and prejudices, by the controversies carried on in the press, and by his associates of later years. The value of what is recorded is therefore materially lessened, but if due allowance is made, it can still be useful to the student of the war and reconstruction periods. Mr. Welles had acquired a certain perspective and could make generalizations which immediate contacts and crowded hours earlier did not permit. Whether he intended these narratives to be published can not be determined definitely. Each one has some material not recorded in the other two, and each has considerable that is given in the others.

The diary appears to have been used frequently for reference, but a good deal of information contained in these retrospective writings does not appear in the diary. An instance of this is the recording of a meeting in the War Department on Sunday evening, April 16, 1865, at which Stanton divulged a Cabinet secret. Brief mention of it is made in the *Diary* (II. 261). The account given in the "Narrative of Events Commencing March 6, 1861", differs from it somewhat in details and is followed by this observation:

This occurrence confirmed an impression which I had previously entertained, and of which I subsequently became fully satisfied, that Mr.

Stanton was in the practice of consulting with and communicating in confidence to certain silent friends important measures of administration while yet they were Cabinet secrets. His confidants may not always have been the same on every question, nor were his communications in every instance limited to members of Congress, though they were usually the only ones to whom he imparted information. But these clandestine communications drew around him a set of men, who made him their champion and leader against both Lincoln and Johnson.

When this is read in the light of the Black-Wilson controversy in 1870-1871, regarding Mr. Stanton and the Buchanan administration, and the activities of the Congressional Radicals during the Lincoln and Johnson administrations, it strengthens the charge that Stanton played the rôle of go-between while a Cabinet officer under three presidents.

A. HOWARD MENEELY.

#### NARRATIVE OF EVENTS<sup>1</sup>

In the organization of his Cabinet Mr. Lincoln had experienced some difficulty. A strong effort was made by the friends of Mr. Seward to exclude Mr. Chase and some alleged early committals by friends of Mr. L. were said to have been made for Mr. Cameron for the office of Secretary of the Treasury. Without adverting to that contest further at this time, it is sufficient that Mr. Chase went into the Treasury and Mr. Cameron into the War Department. It was intended that this arrangement should be considered a triumph by neither. If Mr. Chase obtained the Treasury Mr. Seward had a friend in whom he did not confide but who was a skilful party tactician associated in the council of the President to co-operate with and sustain him. But Mr. Cameron was himself not without political aspirations which in a brief period had an effect adverse to Mr. Seward and favorable to Mr. Chase.

The understanding that existed between Mr. Seward and Cameron at the organization of the Cabinet and not a very high appreciation of the abilities of Mr. Cameron led Mr. Seward to believe he might make himself familiar with the War Department, and assume as occasion required some of the duties of Secretary of War, an assumption that was not entirely satisfactory to that officer. Mr. Cameron was not destitute of discernment, and had friends to inform and advise him also. Neither to him nor them was it altogether pleasant that he should be considered as a mere secondary personage, or convenience to the Secretary of State, yet this was at the beginning the received opinion, and both Mr. Seward and his supporters were willing to encourage and strengthen that opinion. The readiness with which the Secretary of State entered upon the discharge of the duties of the war power, and the manner in which it was done in some cases caused public discontent and brought out in strong relief the subordinate position of Cameron.

Without tracing these matters in detail it may be stated that after a few months, the intimacy between the Secretary of the Treasury and the

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Welles's last revision is used here. The changes made in this narrative were mainly for the sake of style and clarity. There was no radical alteration of meaning.

Secretary of War was as great certainly as between the latter and the Secretary of State. Mr. Seward was not the first to detect this change in a man whom he supposed identified with him in all matters. When finally and fully convinced of the growing friendship between Mr. Cameron and Mr. Chase, the grumblings against the management of the War Department and vicious contracts in Military affairs began to make an impression on the Administration. Still I had no thought that any thing serious or decisive in regard to Mr. Cameron would take place until the Friday or Saturday preceding the second of December session of Congress in 1861. The heads of each of the Departments had presented to the President an abstract of the essential parts of their respective reports and he had read to us his completed message when he asked for my full report, which I immediately gave him. On Saturday I learned he was displeased with portions of the report of the Secretary of War and quite as much displeased that it had been printed, and to some extent distributed without its being first submitted to him. He was especially dissatisfied with that part which assumed to state or enunciate the policy to be pursued by the Administration in regard to slaves. Cameron justified himself on the ground that there was nothing novel in his report—that it was the course pursued by the Army which had been acquiesced in and he supposed approved by the President and Cabinet and asserted that the report of the Secretary of the Navy, though more brief was as explicit and as objectionable in that respect as his.<sup>2</sup> In the discussions that took place Cameron found a friend and supporter in the Secretary of the Treasury, but the Secretary of State attempted no excuse or justification—interposed no plea to mitigate the decision which was impending if not already decided.

Mr. Chase apologised for Cameron, befriended and defended him. No one condemned his views though there was a general disapproval of his enunciation of a policy which if it were the policy of the Administration properly belonged to the President to communicate to Congress and the country. There was great sensitiveness in the public mind on the subject. Fremont had been disciplined in regard to it. The conclusion to which the government would arrive was not doubted; but that one of the heads of department should make it a prominent part of his report, and, without consulting the President to whom it was addressed and on whom was the responsibility of the measure and to whom it properly belonged to determine the policy of the Administration and communicate it to Congress, was admitted to be indecorous and improper. The President ordered that part of the report which he deemed intrusive and objectionable to be expunged, and thus expurgated it was transmitted with the other documents that accompanied the President's message to Congress. There was no alternative for Mr. Cameron but to submit, yet neither he nor any member of the Cabinet supposed that the difficulty was then dis-

<sup>2</sup> On this point in the "Narrative of Events Commencing March 6, 1861", Mr. Welles originally wrote: "The pretext that Mr. Cameron was compelled to leave on account of some expressions in his Annual report was a feeble one and few were misled by it. My report was, in that particular, about as exceptionable, and Mr. Cameron so stated when the President expressed his dissatisfaction and Cameron became aware he could not remain." This passage was later stricken out with pencil (perhaps by Mr. Welles) and is omitted from the printed text. *Diary*, I. 58.



posed of. His report had gone forth to the country, but the true official document did not contain the exceptionable passage. There were other allegations against the Secretary of War by personal and party opponents, his surroundings were not such as to inspire confidence, but these matters were never brought before the cabinet in any form if they even had any influence on executive action.

I had no doubt from the aspect of affairs after the first of December that Mr. Cameron was to leave the Cabinet, nor do I think there was any doubts on his part or that of most of his colleagues. The President had made up his mind to dispense with his services. Mr. Chase may have entertained a lingering hope that he would be retained, but Messrs Blair, Smith and Bates viewed it like myself as a question already decided, and our speculations were as to who would be Mr. Cameron's successor.

The subject, however, lingered along for several weeks without any announcement of final action. I was intensely occupied with affairs then pressing upon me, yet not without a natural interest as to who would be our future associate; inquiries were interchanged as we casually met in Cabinet or on business.

When on the                      of January Mr. Edwin M. Stanton was appointed, it was a surprise to every member of the Cabinet except Mr. Seward and Mr. Chase. I was first informed of it by Mr. Blair whom I met in the street. He had just been advised of the fact by President Lincoln who had sent, or was about to send the nomination of Mr. Stanton to the Senate.<sup>3</sup>

There has been some disputation in regard to the selection of this gentleman and how it was brought about, and also as to the reasons of Mr. Cameron's retirement.<sup>4</sup> The latter is represented to have been voluntary—that the part and duties of the War Department was not congenial—that he tendered his resignation and accepted the Russian Mission from choice. This statement is undoubtedly the most soothing and acceptable to Mr. Cameron, and his friends, but it is not correct. The time has past when a true statement can affect his aspirations, and were he alone concerned, the mere matter of his compulsory or voluntary retirement from the War Department except as an historical fact might be of little interest. I know, and know from his own lips, that he left the Cabinet with reluctance—that he regretted the necessity which compelled him to relinquish the position—and that he believed if Mr. Seward had been so disposed, he could have remained.

Both Messrs Seward and Cameron were skilful and adroit tacticians. They had been to some extent rival candidates with Mr. Lincoln for the nomination at Chicago in 1860. Cameron's expectations were certainly less sanguine than Seward's, for he had no party strength, but knowing the decided opposition to Mr. Seward without concentration on any other he relied on the skilful management of himself and his agents with such appliances as he had practiced in Pennsylvania to succeed in the general scramble and uncertainty which prevailed in regard to candidates to secure the nomination. Mr. Seward confidently expected the nomination. A plurality of the convention and of the republican party anticipated his election and many earnestly desired it, but most of the democratic re-

<sup>3</sup> The nomination of Stanton was sent to the Senate on Jan. 13, 1862, and confirmed on Jan. 15.

<sup>4</sup> Probably refers to the Black-Wilson controversy, *Atlantic Monthly*, XXV. 234-246, XXVI. 463-475; *Galaxy*, IX. 817-831, XI. 257-276.



publicans, that is republicans of democratic antecedents and some of the earnest and sincere whigs were very decidedly opposed to him. No management or means on the part of his friends were availing. A swarm of old party runners and lobbyists and small local partisans from New York, assisted by a similar class in other states, lead by Thurlow Weed, had gathered at Chicago in the full confidence of complete success. Mr. Seward not doubting his own nomination had repaired to Auburn from Washington to receive the Committee which was to announce to him that he was the republican candidate. Great and almost overwhelming was the disappointment which followed the selection of Abraham Lincoln, and for a time some of the other candidates and their friends were cool and indifferent, or actually opposed to the ticket nominated at Chicago. Not so however was the course of Mr. Seward and his supporters. Their personal disappointment was greater than that of either of the rival candidates, but they were earnest and sagacious party men, and soon recovered from the shock which had astounded them. Incipient steps were promptly taken to establish cordial and intimate relations with Mr. Lincoln. Before returning East, Mr. Thurlow Weed by, or with the advice and approval of Mr. Preston King, who while friendly to Mr. Seward was earnestly devoted to Republican views, privately sought and obtained an interview with Mr. Lincoln at Springfield, and succeeded in establishing friendly and to a certain extent confidential relations for the future, and virtually secured for Mr. Seward the first place in the Cabinet of 1861.

Mr. Cameron held aloof until a later day. His object and ends were more personal than political. He had been associated with the democratic party, but his principles sat loose upon him. Little confidence was reposed in his party fidelity. To his personal friends he was always faithful and true—never abandoning them even if his party demanded the sacrifice. By this policy, and the free use of public and corporate patronage and money which he did not affect to conceal, he had built up a power in Pennsylvania that was formidable, and controlled in a great measure the party political movements of that State. In the controversies that were pending he had generally acted with the republicans, and was an avowed personal and party opponent of President Buchanan with whom he had a difference of ten years standing. When the Chicago nomination was made the question with him was, how and in what way was Cameron to be benefitted. Mr. Seward and his friend Weed understood him and after a little time it was whispered among Cameron's Pennsylvania intimates that the Treasury Department which he demanded would, doubtless be given him, but it was no where credited. The belief that such an appointment would be made was harmful. No favorable response came from any quarter out of Pennsylvania, nor but a feeble approval there. Cameron was watchful and reserved until late in the summer, when Judge David Davis and Mr. Swett met Cameron, Thurlow Weed and two or three others at Saratoga, and it was arranged that Pennsylvania should, in the event of Lincoln's success, have the Treasury and that Cameron should receive the Cabinet appointment of that State.

The committals at Saratoga became a serious embarrassment to Mr. Lincoln when organizing his Cabinet. He felt that he could not give the Treasury to Mr. Cameron—was satisfied that it was not in itself a proper appointment—and the opinions of his best and most reliable friends were almost unanimously against it, and almost as unanimously in favor of Mr. Chase. This however was extremely distasteful to Mr.

Seward. There was a rivalry between him and Mr. Chase for national favor, and there were other differences which could not be reconciled. In fact the friends of Mr. Seward anticipated and expected that, through Cameron's influence they should conciliate and consolidate Pennsylvania and New York for future party operations, not only during the administration of Mr. Lincoln, but thereafter, while Mr. Chase, a younger and rising man, the favorite of Ohio and more acceptable to the Anti-slavery element, was an obstacle in their way. It had contributed to their defeat at Chicago. The zeal for Cameron was less than the opposition to Chase. In the few days that passed from the arrival of Mr. Lincoln in Washington to his inauguration, the ardent friends of Mr. Seward became so interested and excited as to declare in some instances, that New York's favorite son would not consent to go into the Cabinet if Mr. Chase was given the Treasury. These declarations—threats they might be called—if they had any effect were exactly opposite to what was intended. Mr. Lincoln knew with what assiduity and earnestness the post of Secretary of State had been sought for Mr. Seward, and he was under no apprehension that he should have [*sic*] the services of that gentleman, and as soon as he felt he could extricate his friends and relieve himself of the Saratoga committals he tendered the treasury to Mr. Chase, sought to conciliate and reconcile the Albany combination by assigning Cameron to the War Department. Whatever disappointment was experienced on the one hand, or triumph on the other in this decision, each was modified in a few weeks when the civil war gave to the War Department power, patronage and prominence far greater than that of any other Department in the government. The Secretary of the Treasury soon found that his principal labors were required to furnish means for military operations. He was literally the servant—the pecuniary pander of the Secretary of War. Mr. Seward was gratified with this state of things. At the commencement of the Administration he assumed, apparently, that he was—the premier—the Acting President, and that his colleagues in the Cabinet occupied positions subordinate to him. The President, never a presuming man and without much administrative experience, deferred greatly to Mr. Seward whose characteristics were in some respects the opposite of his. Without hesitation the Secretary of State was ready to direct the movements of other branches of government sometimes without even consulting with the heads of the Departments interested and in this matter was, until checked involving the administration in confusion. The War Department he seemed to consider a mere appendage to that of the State, and freely issued orders—projected and sent out expeditions, and did some extraordinary things, which, if to be done at all, should have been by the Administration and properly belonged to the Secretary of War. This intimacy and freedom by which one department assumed mastery of the other was not relished by Mr. Cameron, who had schemes and aspirations and knew his rights and wished them to be respected by the Secretary of State as well as by his other associates. The assumptions of Mr. Seward led to constant and increasing intimacy with the Secretary of the Treasury which had their natural effect and influence on the Secretary of War. The questions that arose, as hostilities progressed, developed the feelings and mental workings of Cameron's mind. He was in no sense an abolitionist, was not a believer in the "irrepressible conflict", but had united with the republicans in the Kansas controversy more from opposition to Buchanan than

from devotion to principle. After hostilities commenced, he became aware, at an earlier moment than many others, that the doom of slavery was fixed, and his intercourse with the Secretary of the Treasury with the necessity of action contributed to his taking an early and decisive stand against the return of slaves who escaped from their owners and had fled within the Union lines. Neither the President nor the Secretary of State was disposed to take any advanced step on the slavery question at that early period; but the subject was pressed on both the Secretaries of War and of the Navy who were compelled to act, and found in Mr. Chase a full and ready supporter of pretty extreme measures. While there was no apparent coldness or estrangement between Mr. Seward and Mr. Cameron, there was a perceptibly increasing friendship and intimacy between the latter and Mr. Chase which did not escape the observation of Mr. S.

When exception was taken to Mr. Cameron's report, and a portion of it was expurgated, no one in the Cabinet including Mr. Cameron himself doubted that he was to leave—no one doubted that Mr. Seward acquiesced in, if he did not improve the occasion to prompt the movement. But the change was delayed. No successor was announced, though it was understood Cameron was to leave. The subject of selecting one of his advisers, a member of his political family, was of so delicate a character—so personal as well as political, that I for one and so I believe with all the Cabinet, except Mr. Seward forbore to intrude upon the President any views or preferences unsolicited. I am not aware that I more than once had any conversation or allusion to the subject, and then it was of the President seeking, but I then, and until the appointment was made, had an impression that he was favorably disposed towards Mr. Blair who was a military man, had received a military education at West Point, and in our Cabinet consultations had exhibited great intelligence, knowledge of military men, sagacity and sound judgement in his suggestions and opinions. My impressions were and still are that his own preferences were for Mr. Blair, but that he was influenced by others, both Seward and Chase to a different course. More than six weeks passed away after it was understood that Cameron was to retire, before any change took place, but they had not been weeks of inaction.

I have no doubts that the appointment of Edwin M. Stanton was projected and determined upon by Mr. Seward before he concluded to give up Cameron. He was dissatisfied with the increasing intimacy between the Secretaries of War and Treasury, and when he beheld the former embarking without reserve in the policy of the latter, on the question of the status of the Negro, Mr. Seward no longer desired that Cameron should be retained in the Cabinet, and it was not difficult for other causes as well as that of slavery impressed the President that it was expedient to relieve the Administration of Cameron. It was more difficult to induce him to receive into his Cabinet Mr. Stanton, for whom he had, to say the least, no special regard. Their slight previous acquaintance had not been such as to win the esteem or respect of Mr. Lincoln. But he was not the man to permit his personal likes, or dislikes to govern his action in cases of public necessity. He knew Mr. Stanton possessed ability and energy, but that he was rough and uncongenial; and he was not fully convinced of his sympathy and right feeling with the administration. He had been a member of Mr. Buchanan's Cabinet and had left the public service with his chief, in company with Mr. Black

with whom he fraternized, and in whose views on existing controverted questions he was supposed to concur. Although a resident of Washington during the dark and eventful period that followed the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln, he had kept aloof from the administration and never called upon the President or any member of his Cabinet, except (perhaps)<sup>5</sup> Mr. Seward. In the selection of local Attorney for the District as early as May or June, Mr. Stanton had been a prominent candidate, and was urged for that place with great zeal by the Secretary of State, and the President, always disposed to secure as many as possible of the prominent democrats as were favorably inclined to the Union cause felt that it might be a judicious appointment.

The discussions which took place in the Cabinet on that occasion precluded the selection of Mr. Stanton, and nothing subsequently occurred to remove the objections which had been made to his receiving that local appointment. But Mr. Seward, when in the Senate, in the winter of 1861, and after it was understood he was to be a member of the New Cabinet, had been approached by Mr. Stanton, and throughout the winter received from him confidential communications disclosing the acts and purposes of the Buchanan administration. These secret revelations—betrayals of confidence—had brought the two gentlemen in close relations, which Mr. Seward, believing it to be personal to himself, did not forget. He was not aware at the time when he proposed a successor to Cameron that Mr. Stanton had made similar secret disclosures to prominent republican Senators, but supposed himself the only recipient of these Cabinet secrets. Could Mr. Stanton be brought into the Cabinet, in place of Mr. Cameron, the Secretary of State assumed he would have a trusty and reliable friend and supporter in the War Department in place of Cameron who had left him for Chase. Indeed, he had assurances to that effect from Mr. Stanton himself, who stated to Mr. Seward as Mr. S.<sup>6</sup> himself informed me that he should sustain his policy, vote with him and remain with him in the Cabinet, and leave whenever he (Seward) left. [He had given similar pledges to Mr. Black when he entered the Buchanan Cabinet, declared Black's principles to be his principles, Black's policy to be his policy and that he should cling to him to the end. This was unknown to Mr. Seward, who did not doubt Stanton's sincerity but believed he was precisely the man whom he wished to have in the War Department, and he succeeded with some difficulty in persuading the President to give up objections and yield to his wishes, when he was made aware of what Stanton had done in the winter of 1861 to counteract [and] defeat the administration of Buchanan of which he was then a part. But the actors, Messrs. Seward and Stanton had apprehensions that there might be difficulty in consummating their scheme.]<sup>7</sup> The

<sup>5</sup> This word was crossed out in revision.

<sup>6</sup> "Narrative of Events Commencing March 6, 1861", indicates that Seward is meant.

<sup>7</sup> Before revision the part in brackets read as follows: "This was precisely the man whom Mr. Seward wanted in the War department, and he had no great difficulty [sic] in persuading the President to yield to his wishes, when made aware of what Stanton had done in the winter of 1861 to embarrass and defeat the administration of which he was a part. But when the President was finally brought into the arrangement, and as a preliminary step exception was taken to the annual report of Mr. Cameron, the actors, Messrs Seward and Stanton began to have apprehensions that there might be difficulty in consummating their scheme."

reluctance of Cameron to leave was much greater than had been anticipated, and if not conciliated he might in his rage go into opposition, and such was his influence and party skill and tact that he would be likely to array Pennsylvania against the Administration in that trying emergency. This would make the acquisition of Stanton very dear to the administration. Although claiming to come from Pennsylvania Stanton had no political or party strength in that state, and he felt his inability to cope with the man whom he was to displace. These difficulties struck him sooner than Mr. Seward, but their force was seen and felt by both. The question arose at once how to appease the doomed man and effect a change by peaceable arrangement. Cameron, who felt humbled and prostrated by the blow, which was to him wholly unexpected, was not unwilling to make terms when he became convinced the President was inflexible on the subject of a change in the War Department. The Russian Mission was open to him, for which he had no qualification whatever, and which nothing, but to escape disgrace, would induce him to accept. To travel a year in Europe as the representative of the government, and visit St. Petersburg without performing any duty would extricate him from some political embarrassments and from the humiliation of an abrupt dismissal. This also enabled him to retain his influence in Pennsylvania.

Another point with Messrs Seward and Stanton, and in which the President concurred, was to reconcile Mr. Chase, who, no more than his associates knew what was being done, and was even less aware that a change was inevitable. Mr. Seward after the retirement of Cameron and the selection of Stanton, was willing to remain incog., step aside and let his rival of the Treasury carry out and take the credit and responsibility of his Seward's plans. Cameron therefore was to consult with Mr. Chase, let him understand in confidence that he proposed to leave the Cabinet, resign the office of Secretary of War and that he should like to retire with grace, which might be effected, if he could only obtain the Russian mission, then filled by Cassius M. Clay an abolition friend of the Secretary of the Treasury. This, already determined fact, Mr. Chase kindly undertook to accomplish, and, as was anticipated, at the same time to secure the appointment of some one on whom he could rely as Cameron's successor. Again the Secretary of the Treasury was the victim, not to say the dupe of a prearranged scheme. He knew not and did not suspect that Stanton had been designated for the place. In talking over the subject of a new Secretary with Cameron, the latter suggested that the appointment ought to, and probably would be given to Pennsylvania. To this Chase assented and in consultation with Cameron, the latter said he knew of no man better adapted to the place than Mr. Stanton, whose appointment as Dist. Attorney Chase had assented to. This proposition readily took. Mr. Chase had an old Ohio acquaintance in Stanton that had been continued, though without special intimacy until the formation of Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet. Some weeks were consumed in these negotiations and the preliminaries which led to them, during which the President kindly suspended action, withdrew his first summary letter to Cameron, accepted his resignation and consented to recall Clay and appoint him Minister to St. Petersburg. Clay came home fired with patriotism to take a commission as Brig. Genl. and be snubbed by Halleck, who would give him no military command and denied his fitness for the service.

In this whole transaction, arranged with such apparent satisfaction, Mr. Seward did not appear, although it was all his own work—Mr. Chase who seems to have been, and undoubtedly himself believed he was the means of effecting these changes, and that they originated with him had really nothing to do with them but to act a part which was adroitly contrived for him to execute.

Different versions have been published of this change in the War Department—some who participated in it have made statements which they doubtless believed were true. I was an observer—a spectator merely not an actor, of these proceedings; and some things came to my knowledge incidentally and in a manner and way unknown to the actors. If as certain gentlemen have represented they know the fact that Mr. Cameron in secrecy proposed to Mr. Stanton that he should take the position—that Mr. Cameron voluntarily relinquished the position—that Mr. Chase first designated Mr. Stanton or communicated to him his appointment—they are measurably deceived, and not possessed of all the facts. Mr. Stanton, I am confident was aware that he had been selected, while Mr. Chase was yet ignorant of the movement, and when the latter called on Stanton and communicated what was intended he conveyed no news to that gentleman. The deception was then and for a considerable period well sustained. I am not sure that the Chief Justice was ever wholly undeceived. For a time he bore himself towards the new Secretary in a manner worthy of a patron, courted his intimacy and friendship, but before he left the Treasury he must have been aware that there were stronger ties between the State and War departments than any which he could weave. In aptness and skill Mr. Chase was never a match for Mr. Seward.



## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

*Le Culte: Étude d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses.* Tome Premier. *Le Caractère Religieux du Culte.* Par ROBERT WILL, Docteur en Théologie. [Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses publiées par la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de l'Université de Strasbourg, fascicule 10.] (Strasbourg and Paris: Istra. 1925. Pp. xiii, 458. 60 fr.)

THE work of Cabrol, Batiffol, and their kind has led the technical student and the general reader to expect from French Catholic liturgiologists discriminating and suggestive insights in the problem of worship. Their writing, however, has been restricted by their source-books, the Missal and the Breviary. Dr. Will's book now brings Protestant thought abreast of what has been, hitherto, the admitted Catholic leadership in this field, and has the added advantage of freer inquiry into the whole subject. The book is of first importance.

An introductory chapter deals with three antinomies which furnish the premise of the problem: religious subjectivity and objectivity, the worshipper and the phenomena or apparatus of worship, the individual and the society. The first of these antinomies receives, as it should receive, constant attention throughout the succeeding pages.

The central and major section of the volume is divided into three "books" in which the author treats, successively, Sacrifice, Mystery, and Prayer. The first two terms bear their familiar connotation. The last, Prayer, is arbitrarily used to connote a type of worship which takes as its premise the Protestant doctrine of the grace of God. The problem as it appears in magical conceptions of sacrifice is that of an unwarranted theurgic confidence and intention on the part of the worshipper. That problem is minimized in mysticism and disappears when the effort to manipulate God by magic matures into filial trust in the free grace of God.

A third book deals with the double attitude in worship, the impulse to adoration and the need of edification, these attitudes being described as our response to the first and final causes of all religious exercise.

A conclusion opens with the candid and accurate observation, "Théoriquement, le problème du culte est insoluble". The antinomies forbid it. But Dr. Will attempts to stabilize the situation and to draft a provisional rhythmic recognition of the situation in a tentative but none the less suggestive order of public worship.

The book draws freely upon material provided by the comparative study of religions, and by the psychology of religion. Its premise, how-



ever, is a patent faith in the initial Protestant doctrine of divine grace, and much of its inspiration, as well as its insight, is drawn from Schleiermacher's practical theology.

Without failing to make full place for the contribution which the familiar contemporary psychological approach to the problem has rendered to its solution, this work is chiefly significant as heralding the necessity for a return on the part of Protestantism to a greater objectivity in the conception and conduct of worship. Humanism receives full and fair recognition, but in the absence of objective, divine reality, or faith in such a reality, worship as a formal transaction languishes and dies. For the Protestant, the theoretical difficulties attaching to public worship have their origin in the known immensities of the outer orders of time and space and the "passionless impersonality" of those immensities. Hence the contemporary retreat to the citadel of a restricted self-consciousness and to the domestic transactions of the psychology of religion. Dr. Will sees that this is, ultimately, the counsel of despair. As Mr. Havelock Ellis has recently remarked, what is necessary in life is not to find some one who has the answer to your problem, but some one who knows what the problem is. In Dr. Will we have found a fellow-religionist who knows what our problem is.

WILLARD L. SPERRY.

*The History and Prospects of the Social Sciences.* By Harry Elmer Barnes, Karl Worth Bigelow, Jean Brunhes, Robert Chenault Givler, Alexander Goldenweiser, Frank Hamilton Hankins, Howard Madison Parshley, Roscoe Pound, Walter James Shepard, Kimball Young. Edited with an introduction by HARRY ELMER BARNES, Professor of Historical Sociology, Smith College. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1925. Pp. xxi, 534. \$5.00.)

THE boundaries of human knowledge are pushed forward by two main processes. One is the work of specialized investigators, who select a specific and narrow problem, and by careful observation, experiment, and reasoning exhaust all available information on that question. The other is the work of broadly informed generalizers, who take a bird's-eye view of a large problem, utilize and correlate the work of the specialists, and show the interrelations and meanings of their contributions. Sometimes one process is more necessary and more prominent; sometimes the other. In the complex field of the social sciences, this double method is especially important. In recent years, the specialized work of anthropologists, biologists, psychologists, geographers, historians, economists, political scientists, sociologists, jurists, and philosophers has enormously widened our knowledge of man's life, activities, and associations. It is now especially important to bring their results together, to show how their contributions are related, and to take stock of the progress that has been made in build-

ing up a scientific study of social relations. In this field, Professor Barnes is doing excellent work.

The volume under review is a series of chapters, each summarizing the history, the contributions, and the literature of the various fields mentioned above. The editor deals with history; Jean Brunhes, with human geography; H. M. Parshley, with biology; K. Young, with social psychology; A. Goldenweiser, with cultural anthropology; F. H. Hankins, with sociology; K. W. Bigelow, with economics; W. J. Shepard, with political science; Roscoe Pound, with jurisprudence; and R. C. Givler, with ethics.

Because of this method there is a certain unevenness in treatment and a considerable amount of repetition. Because of the wide scope of the fields covered, so much condensation is necessary that in some cases the chapters are little more than topical outlines and bibliographical lists. Nevertheless, the cumulative effect of the volume is to emphasize the complexity of the social sciences, the main contributions of the specialized fields, and the large number of scholars who have contributed to their recent development. The interrelation of the various fields is, however, left mainly to the intelligence of the reader. The general attitude of the various authors is optimistic, holding that co-operative research and the application of the contributions of science and technology to human society can remedy many of the evils in social relationships. Especial emphasis is laid on the change from the local to the cosmopolitan view-point, and on the change from the theological and metaphysical method of approach to the historical, sociological, and scientific attitude of mind.

A large part of the volume consists of a condensed presentation of material thoroughly familiar to all students of the social studies. The chapters on human geography and biology, however, present a background which social scientists have often neglected, and the chapter on social psychology is a distinct contribution. The sections dealing with the future prospects of the social sciences are, perhaps necessarily, brief. Especially suggestive are the *Problems of Jurisprudence Today*, and the *Reconstruction of Ethical Theory*. The attitude of some of the authors is by no means entirely objective. Professor Shepard's theory of the state and of sovereignty is obviously influenced by the writings of Laski, Duguit, and Krabbe, and Professor Pound's well-known theory of jurisprudence is clearly in evidence. In general, the authors represent a liberal rather than a conservative attitude toward present-day issues.

The foot-notes furnish an excellent guide to recent literature in the various fields, and brief but well-chosen references are appended to each chapter. The index is limited almost entirely to a list of the names of authors cited.

RAYMOND G. GETTELL.

*The Peoples of Asia.* By L. H. DUDLEY BUXTON, M.A., F.S.A.,  
Lecturer in Physical Anthropology, University of Oxford. [The  
History of Civilization, edited by C. K. Ogden, M.A.] (New  
York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1925. Pp. xiii, 271. \$5.00.)

As a result of a round-the-world journey, combined with his other studies, Dr. Buxton has given us a very readable and good book on a subject of much importance. It is not too much to say that if we had a thorough knowledge of the racial history of Asia we should be very near a final understanding of the history of mankind as a whole. For the great central continent, intimately connected on one side with Europe and Africa, opens on the other side towards the rest of the world and has for many thousands of years, in fact during the whole postglacial time, if not before, been receiving human groups, augmenting and mixing them, and eventually sending their offshoots in all directions. Many writers would, without bothering about proofs, make of Asia and particularly of its inhospitable central parts the very cradle of man—a loose notion to which our author is too sensible to subscribe before conclusive evidence be presented.

The volume deals with: the Races of Asia; the Origin of the Asiatic Races; Western Asia; India; China; the Fringing Lands of China; Arctic Asia; Japan; South-Eastern Asia and Indonesia; with summary, bibliography, index of tribal names, and general index. The ideas expressed are in general pleasingly sound, even if not final or wholly devoid of the influence of past views and tendencies. There is much that will be changed in future editions, if the author, as is to be hoped, will persist in personal field observations, and as he overcomes the incubus of the past. The illustrations will be replaced, the bibliography unified and amended, and as experience accumulates the reliance upon individual indexes, symbols, or mathematical processes will probably grow less. But, already as it is, the volume may well be recommended to students of the problems with which it deals.

The main conclusions of Dr. Buxton are as follows:

Biologically the majority of the races of Asia from the extreme west to the east are closely connected with those of Europe. The distinctions between them are probably not greater than might be said to warrant the term local varieties, although in some cases the differentiation seems to be sufficient to make the use of the word "sub-race" admissible. In Eastern Asia, however, there seems to be very widely spread a group of peoples, conveniently termed Yellow man, who seem to be more remotely connected with the races of Europe. Even here the degree of divergence is to a certain extent a matter of dispute. Finally, in remote parts of South-eastern Asia there are sporadic traces of an entirely different type of man, who, all ethnologists are agreed, must be considered as widely differentiated from the other two groups.

In numbers the Negritos are so few as to form an infinitesimal part of the peoples of Asia. Yellow man is very numerous, and probably the greater part of the population of Asia belongs to this race, but the other

racess are very plentiful and may have slight majority. The smaller varieties of the great stocks are also present in large numbers, although they seem to be divided into certain marked categories. As far as can be judged with evidence that has been collected at present these varieties seem to be dominant in certain well-marked regions, so that in spite of divergencies in detail it is often possible to state in broad outline the physical type which inhabits a certain area. But this can hardly ever be done with the same accuracy as can be attained in plotting the distribution of a language or of a religion. It can never be done with the precise exactitude with which modern nations endeavour to define their political frontiers.

In connection with Dr. Buxton's theme the reader may find it of advantage to consult the article, which evidently was not available to Dr. Buxton, on "The Peopling of Asia" in the *Proceedings* of the American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia, 1921, LX., no. 4).

*The Dawn of European Civilization.* By V. GORDON CHILDE, B.Litt.  
[The History of Civilization, edited by C. K. Ogden, M.A.]  
(New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1925. Pp. xvi, 328. \$6.00.)

WHILE on the earliest period of the evolution of human civilization we have excellent general surveys—those of de Morgan, Osborn, and Obermaier—while for the evolution of art in the prehistoric period we use the trustworthy guidance of Hoernes and of his re-editors, while finally many books of the same general character (especially those of Peet and Déchelette) present a fair and complete picture of the later prehistoric periods—the bronze and the iron ages—yet for the intermediary period, that of the neolithic and of the copper ages, we possess no authoritative general treatment by one of the leading scholars in the field of anthropology and prehistory. And yet for the history of human civilization this period has an enormous importance. It was in this period that the main foundations both of the Oriental and of the Western civilizations were laid. In fact the neolithic and the copper ages witnessed the beginnings of all the leading civilizations of mankind: the early Central Asiatic civilization, those of Sumer and Babylonia, of Asia Minor, of Syria and Egypt, and finally those of Central, Southern, and Eastern Europe, including the early and late Minoan and the early and late Helladic civilizations.

A general characterization of these beginnings has been many times attempted, many scholars have given partial pictures confined to some of the separate areas of this civilization, but no one has endeavored to sum up substantially and to organize all our information on this problem and to present a general survey of the achievements which have been accomplished by the various scholars of different nationalities. No one of the now living scholars was better prepared to carry out this task than Mr. V. Gordon Childe. Mr. Childe has travelled far and wide, he knows all the areas of which he is talking, he is an excellent linguist, he can read books and articles—as far as we can judge from the contents of his book—in

almost all the European languages including the Slavonic, and has acquired during his travels a wide personal knowledge of the leading archaeologists.

No wonder that his book is one of the best books which have been written on the difficult and thorny questions of prehistoric archaeology, a book free from racial prejudices, which still influence so many of the leading men in this field, and from any bias, a book full of useful information and interesting suggestions. Under the competent guidance of Mr. Childe we visit the various areas of prehistoric development, meeting first the "food-gatherers" of the late palaeolithic period, crossing the Aegean Sea to find the earliest European and Asiatic civilizations in their earliest stages, shifting from the East to the West, to Sardinia, Spain, Gaul, Italy, visiting the steppes of South Russia, the valley of the Danube and the plains and the mountains of the Balkan Peninsula, landing in that promised land of prehistoric archaeology which is Scandinavia, roaming about the northern areas of the Baltic shores and of Germany, paying a short visit to the lake-dwellers of the Alpine region, and finally making our acquaintance with the megalithic culture of the Atlantic and with the Atlantic and Central European cultures in Britain.

In every one of these areas Mr. Childe is a most competent and well-informed guide. He presents us with a summary of the archaeological investigation of the corresponding area, characterizes the main features of it and reproduces the most typical articles of this area in good though sketchy drawings, gives an excellent short survey of the relations of this area to its neighbors, and finally presents a general sketch of its contribution to human civilization in general. To each chapter a short but substantial bibliography is appended, and at the end of the volume four interesting maps summarize his views on the general evolution of civilization from approximately 3000 to 1600 B. C. in historical sequence, views based on the distribution of the most characteristic articles of every period.

His general conclusions cannot be repeated in this short review. They are not and cannot be in the present state of our knowledge definitive. I must emphasize, however, that I regard his point of view as perfectly sound and correct. Let me quote his wise and sane remarks in the preface which show how difficult and how vexed his problem was. "My theme", he says, "is the foundation of European civilization as a peculiar and individual manifestation of the human spirit. But on this topic sharply divided views are current. One school maintains that Western civilization only began in historic times after 1000 B. C. . . . On the other hand some of my colleagues would discover the origin of all the higher elements in human culture in Europe itself. I can subscribe to neither of these extreme views; the truth seems to me to lie between them." The whole book is the best proof of this general statement. And I would advise everybody who has an interest in the beginnings of European civilization carefully to read the book and to form his own conclusion from the material which is presented to him in such an able form and in such full shape.

M. ROSTOVITZ.

*The Size of the Slave Population at Athens during the Fifth and Fourth Centuries before Christ.* By RACHEL LOUIS SARGENT, Professor of Greek and Latin, Northwestern College. [University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. XII., no. 3.] (Urbana: University of Illinois. 1925. Pp. 136. \$1.75.)

THIS study has two missions, one for those who keep on repeating that Athens had a slave population many times more numerous than its free, and another for those who know it had not. To the former "the fable that the Greeks were a race of impractical contemplative aesthetes who kept a tribe of tame drudges to minister to their material needs" is an article of faith or a doctrinal necessity; they would not be convinced by the present book even if they could be got to read it. What is now needed by the latter is something positive, capable of being affirmed as probable, with which to replace their hitherto ineffective negative. We did not have to wait for Professor Sargent's study to give the quietus to the Roman tradition on the matter of the size of the slave population in Athens—that was done by Hume and Letronne over a century ago, or to demolish the great Boeckh's unhappy attempt to revive it—that was done by Beloch, whose clear-headed handling of the statistics of the case has been strengthened by interpretations of them given notably by Meyer, Ciccotti, Francotte, and Zimmern. That the 400,000 Attic slaves of Ctesicles and the 150,000 rural slaves attributed to Athens on the basis of a mutilated Hypereides fragment are impossible, is accordingly proved *zu Evidenz* by the very useful history of the problem with which Professor Sargent opens her investigation.

The method devised by our authoress for supplanting the varying estimates of these scholars with less impressionistic figures is to collect and analyze all the data contained in the contemporary literature so as to strike averages for the numbers of slaves used at different epochs in the fifth and fourth centuries B. C. by different classes of citizens and metics, in domestic service, agriculture, and industry separately. It thus appears that we are warranted in assuming in the case of the very wealthiest manufacturers an average of fifty-eight industrial slaves and eight or nine domestic slaves, and for the group that comes next in point of wealth one of twenty-two industrial and from two to five domestic slaves; whereas an average of one per family, one per citizen, and one per farm (of, on the average, *ca.* fifteen acres) is all that is permissible in the case of the middle classes in domestic service, trade and industry, and agriculture, respectively. The lower classes are to be thought of as having no slaves at all. These averages, when multiplied by the numbers of citizens and metics estimated (by Meyer and Beloch) to belong to each class, will give tolerably definite totals, allowances being made for overlapping, for children, and for state employees of servile status. There is no use imagining that we attain anything like the precision and certainty of modern statistics. In no case is the average reached strictly arithmetical

or the size of the class fixed exactly; but when applied circumspectly and candidly, as in this case, the method, besides yielding us the available materials assorted with a definite purpose, does permit of conclusions, concordant in the main with those of Beloch, that the slave population of Attica numbered approximately half the free—97,000 to 73,000 in the time of Pericles and 60,000 to 70,000 a century later.

The workmanship is not flawless. I have noted *Erectheum* (more than once); *Cholleidia* (twice); *I. G.* IV 2, instead of *C. I. A.* IV 2 or *I. G.* II 5 (repeatedly); *Collytus*, instead of Demeas of Collytus, and *Polystratus*, instead of Phrynichus (indicative of hasty reading of Lysias); some defective arithmetic on p. 47. But the argument is well developed and the case well presented.

W. S. FERGUSON.

#### BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*A History of England.* By HILAIRE BELLOC. Volume I. (London: Methuen; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1925. Pp. xiii, 421. 15 s.)

IN spite of a very vigorous style, a real feeling for topography and places, and some very spirited narrative sections, like those dealing with Caesar's invasion of Britain, Britain as a Roman province, and England under the house of Alfred, this volume, the first of four, is not worth serious consideration as history. Its author's very approach is unhistorical. History, in Mr. Belloc's mind, is apparently a medium for exposition of his well-known ideas about the excellences of Roman Catholic civilization, the superiority of Latin culture to German culture, and incidentally, the disintegrating effects of wealth upon morale. While all these opinions may or may not be true, and while history developed as an inductive science may illustrate their truth, any conscious attempt to make history prove them is bound to result in a perversion of history into propaganda. Mr. Belloc's frankness in stating that he begins with a set of theses which he intends to emphasize disarms criticism somewhat, but it does not make his effort any more valuable. He holds that "religion is the determining force of society", "that the inhabitants of Great Britain were never greatly changed in stock by any invasion", and that their institutions "derive not from imaginary barbarian ancestry, but from known and recorded Roman civilization". His methods of applying these primary assumptions vitiate his book even in detail.

In order, for example, to hold to the Roman character of civilization in England, it is requisite to reduce all Anglo-Saxon elements in English institutions, in English speech, and in English blood to the smallest limits. This Mr. Belloc does with a thoroughness that would leave earlier Romanists envious. In the first place, the Germans had no institutions.



Their parts of Europe were wholly barbaric and obscure, and they a mass of savages without organized religion or culture of any recognizable kind. Everything among them, tradition in word and thing, was Roman. Likewise, they had no speech of their own, beyond a very limited vocabulary. Accepting as completely proved the theses of Professor Wiener which most philologists reject, Mr. Belloc grants the Germans a few words of their own, but insists that most so-called German words were really badly understood Latin or Greek words. Accordingly, when the Germans came to England, they brought mostly degraded Roman speech, and what they added to existing English speech was largely Roman. Furthermore, as will be explained in volume II., even this mixture was further diluted with Norman-French in the time of the Black Death, before it became English. Finally the Germans made practically no additions to the blood of the English race. The Anglo-Saxon invasions? There weren't any, beyond those of a few bands of pirates. This is really a hard saying, because, after all, there is a tradition about Anglo-Saxon invasions, and Mr. Belloc is fond of tradition even to the extent of introducing into his book Constantine's vision of the Labarum, St. Helena's Invention of the True Cross, and even the beginnings of Catholicism in England, in the apostolic age, at Glastonbury. The tradition of invasions must therefore be examined. By rejecting all but contemporary accounts, even though in another connection Bede seems to be used as an authority for the much earlier matter of the letter of Lucius to Eleutherius, bishop of Rome in the second century, by neglecting the few Continental references in Prosper and the geographer of Ravenna, by overlooking the archaeology of the destroyed Roman towns, since archaeology leads only to guesswork, and by relying upon the analogy of the later Danish invasions, Mr. Belloc as much understates the Anglo-Saxon invasions as Germanists have overstressed them. To make the few surviving bands even more insignificant, they are landed in a country inhabited by millions. For since agriculture did not change until the seventeenth century, England probably supported as many people in this period as in the seventeenth century.

Since it is necessary to account for the stubborn fact of English speech, which after all has a few German words in it, Mr. Belloc concedes more Germans than came in the invasions—thoroughly Romanized soldiers and pirates colonized on the Saxon shore between 250 and 400 A.D. With this German element already present, in the degraded state of Roman society in Britain, where a few rich men controlled all the rest of the population, the slaughter of the rich made it possible for a handful of men not only to seize political power, but also to change the speech of great masses. Little German courts were established to which the Christian missionaries came, bringing the doctrine of transubstantiation handed down from the apostles. As Christianity spread through the medium of the Teutonic courts, their dialects spread into the rest of the island.

It is only fair to state that the bed of Procrustes is less used in some other parts of the volume.

F. C. DIETZ.

*Joan of Arc, Maid of France.* By ALBERT BIGELOW PAINE. Two volumes. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. xiv, 367; x, 379. \$10.00.)

THE appearance of a new and voluminous study of one of the most fascinating yet baffling persons in medieval history at once arouses hope that some better understanding of an extraordinary phase of the Hundred Years' War is at hand. Anyone approaching the present work with such expectations, however, will be profoundly disappointed. Nothing of the kind is even attempted. Mr. Paine has contributed rather to the cult of St. Joan of Arc than to history. The initial impulse to write, he states, came from reading and re-reading Mark Twain. This was followed by repeated pilgrimage to the scenes of Joan's career. This, in turn, has been supplemented by "something more than four years" of historical study "of official documents, letters, and contemporary chronicles, many of them to be had only in the French of the early fifteenth century, with cryptic variants none too readily acquired". For the most part this study seems to have been confined to Quicherat's collection, somewhat supplemented from editions or translations of Joan's two trials by Vallet de Viriville, Fabre, and Champion. This would, of course, be the basis in large measure for any study of the period. But grave doubts of the author's scholarly competence are excited by his naïve statement that the chronicles which he has used are to be "found in volume IV. of M. Quicherat's great collection. With one exception; they are in early French and so far as the writer knows have never been printed elsewhere" (reviewer's italics). He then mentions, among others, Chastelain, Monstrelet, Lefèvre de Saint-Remi, Waurin, Perceval de Cagny, Clément de Fauquembergue, and the *Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris*. Ignorance of the editorial work of Tuetey, Douët d'Arcq, and Kervyn de Lettenhove (not to mention others), and of the publications of the Société de l'Histoire de France and the Société de l'Histoire de Paris, and of the Rolls Series, will hardly commend the author to scholars.

Mr. Paine asserts that he has co-ordinated the testimony "without slighting or garbling it in the interest of any preconceived notions of [his] own". In so far as much of the book consists of translated quotations this is true, but if anyone supposes that the treatment is objective and without bias he is mistaken. Throughout, the author is an ardent and chivalrous champion of his heroine. He shows annoyance that someone has surmised that Joan was plain. The insulting letters of Bedford and the taunts of the English captains anger him. He shows peevishness towards Joan's modern critics, classifies them with her contemporary enemies, and sneers at historians for being critical after the event! Those who question Joan's military skill are particularly out of favor. "That she had no regular commission, that Alençon, then or later, held the official command, signifies nothing. Alençon and Joan were as one in military matters, that *one* being Joan." Apparently it is assumed that

the following narrative bears out this dictum, but such is not the case. The story as told leaves all the original doubts just where they were before. The critics who question Joan's military skill "rarely, if ever, [take] her native common-sense, and still more rarely her Voices, into account." And what were Joan's Voices? It would seem that for the author they were veritably saints from Heaven. Yet even he admits that they had limitations. They could not reckon on treachery, although it is assumed that they could inform Joan of conditions among the English. When he writes "that this ass of a King was the beneficiary of Joan of Arc is the anomaly of the ages", he admits, at least by implication, the fundamental problem of the Voices, but he seems to prefer an anomaly to any attempt at rational explanation. Those who study the whole period will be inclined to doubt that Joan united the French captains "as nothing else had ever done". It is similarly very questionable that "whatever the French mean today by 'Patrie', and it means more than is conveyed by any similar word of any other nation, was first realized for them in Joan of Arc". And to summarize in four pages the last twenty-three years of the Hundred Years' War, and to conclude the summary with the sentence "Joan had marched, and France was free", certainly gives a highly distorted impression.

Any real student of the fifteenth century will continue to prefer, for his English life of Joan, the more sober and balanced work of Francis Lowell. Sentimental tourists, however, will find this book much to their taste. It is written in a lively style. Extensive quotation gives it a picturesque, antiquarian flavor. The occasional descriptive chapters will provide a pleasant guide-book directing the traveller to the old buildings which may have looked down on Joan in the flesh, and the places which her presence hallowed, even though "the spot of her capture is a good ten feet below the surface" of the ground.

RICHARD A. NEWHALL.

*Edward IV.'s French Expedition of 1475*, being MS. 2 M. 16 College of Arms. By FRANCIS PIERREPONT BARNARD, M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A., Hon. Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1925. Pp. xv, 162. 21 s.)

THIS is a handsome volume containing a facsimile of a manuscript roll in the College of Arms and extensive notes by a scholar already well known as the editor of the useful *Companion to English History (Middle Ages)* recently reprinted in an enlarged form. On the roll is recorded a "declaration" of the second quarter's wages, paid at Canterbury in June, 1475, by John Sorell and John Fitzherbert, tellers of the Exchequer of Receipt, to the troops about to accompany Edward IV. to France, and to the two thousand archers being sent at the same time to the support of Francis II., duke of Brittany. The record is of considerable value be-

cause it supplies additional evidence regarding the size and cost of an army which Philip de Commynes asserts was the largest and best-armed force ever taken to France by an English king. Five dukes, Clarence, Gloucester, Norfolk, Suffolk, and Buckingham, presented themselves at Canterbury, but Buckingham, for some reason, "returned home"—a fact which doubtless explains why on Tellers' Roll, no. 51A, where there are entries of payments to the army going to France, a blank space is left after the duke's name. Only four dukes, therefore, appear to have crossed to France. In addition, Edward had with him six earls (with the newly created Marquis of Dorset, the queen's son, reckoned in the number), thirteen barons, twelve bannerets, eighteen knights, and one hundred and seventy-three squires and gentlemen. Each of these "captains" brought with him a retinue of "spears" and archers. The spears amounted all told, according to the summary at the head of the roll, to 1198, but there is an unfortunate disagreement in the figures when it comes to the archers, their total number being given in one place as 8666, in another as 9695. Either figure is below Commynes's estimate, or guess, of fifteen thousand. Whether the College of Arms roll can be accepted as definitive testimony on this point is, however, doubtful, as the entries on the Tellers' Rolls do not seem to agree with it altogether. It is notorious that accounts were none too well kept in those days.

The whole amount paid to the king's army for this second quarter's wages seems to have been £32,015 13s. 10d., and to this must be added £4550 handed over to Audley and Duras for their men. This was an enormous sum of money for that period, and it is little wonder that Edward was so troubled by "lack of gold" that he had to turn to the Medicis and the Portinaris for loans and to the citizens of London for a benevolence.

But the size and cost of the king's army were of less interest to the compiler of the College of Arms manuscript than the badges of its noble leaders, and his drawings of these badges remind one, in their expressiveness and naïve charm, of a child's early efforts with the pencil. The "blake bulle" of the Duke of Clarence's badge might be taken for a pensive stag, but Gloucester's "whitt bore" has life-like tusks and a generally fierce expression. The "whytt greyhonde" of Sir John Mauleverer resembles a dachshund except as to its ears, and the "maydyn hed" of Sir William Parre has a coy simper and bobbed hair.

The notes provided by the editor are biographical and heraldic. They are minute and painstaking, but practically no use has been made of unpublished records. There are admirable indexes of persons and places, and a bibliography rather unnecessarily long.

CORA L. SCOFIELD.

*Luther and the Reformation.* By JAMES MACKINNON, Ph.D., D.D.,  
Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, University of Edinburgh.  
Volume I. *Early Life and Religious Development to 1517.* (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1925. Pp. xix, 317. 16 s.)

THERE is wide room for a new biography of Luther in English; the quadricentennial has brought the German literature to flood-tide, while newer depths as well as fullness of knowledge are now attainable since such sources of first-rate importance as Luther's marginal notes to Augustine, Lombard, Anselm, Tauler (1509-1511), the course on the Psalms (1513-1515), and the lectures on the Epistle to the Romans (1515-1516) have become available. These latter, indeed, are of special importance to Professor Mackinnon, for he is emphatic in stating that the Reformation was essentially a religious movement of which Luther was the centre and to which he contributed the impulsion, that Luther's impelling force was his new conception of the relation of the individual soul to God, and that the problem of cardinal importance is how he attained to this new religious conception, a problem to be solved (since the "illumination" was the fruit of Luther's early religious experience as a monk) only through study of his development to 1517.

Such a study concerns itself with theology, and though with courage and severe persistence the author treads a path through the subtle sands of scholastic philosophy he has not made the going much easier for his hopeful followers. Along an arduous route he has planned his stages well, indeed; but the very core of his contribution, a long discussion of the New Theology and its Development, scholarly, sensible, and abundantly rich in matter, is the book's least effective chapter. Nor is this wholly the result of century-long remoteness, nor the fault of Luther groping in labyrinthine ways for light. The paraphrasing and presentation are pedestrian. Well does he perceive and emphasize the parallelism of Luther's and Paul's experience; with an even superfluous fullness he analyzes "justification" and "faith"; he grasps the fundamental antithesis of Aristotelian philosophy, which termed that man righteous who did righteous acts, and the Pauline view that no one can do righteous work unless he first become righteous. But he is a guide who plods with gaze to the ground, reluctant even to invoke the freshening word of Luther. Yet what relief when he does permit that word! For the Reformer's words on "theology" are true of Luther's own voice: it "searches out the kernel of the nut and the marrow of the wheat and the bones".

In the many controversial questions the sources have been pondered and the secondary literature generally examined. The judgment of Scheel wins frequent approval. Thus, Luther's resolution to enter the monastery was "unpremeditated and involuntary", and Luther's "Great Illumination", when the cardinal passage in Romans i. 17 was definitely conceived

in the Pauline sense, "must have taken place in the interval between the autumn of 1512 and the summer of 1513"; though Seeberg and Ritschl date the new insight in 1508-1509, Holl in 1511-1513, Müller in 1514, Grisar in 1519. Care is taken to correct the unfounded Protestant tradition of Luther's mistreatment at the hands of fellow Augustinians, as well as the Catholic tradition of the insubordination of the novice and monk. Of the Catholic historians, Denifle is severely flayed for attempting to discredit Luther's account of his discovery of the true meaning of Romans i. 17, and for seeing in Luther's doctrine of justification "nothing but the moral bankruptcy of its author and the moral atrophy of human nature"; while Grisar fails to see how seriously Luther's early teaching diverged from the faith of the Church, and betrays an exterior and mechanical knowledge of what Luther actually taught on justification as moral regeneration.

His preference for theology over humanism has kept the author too much from Allen's *Epistolae Erasmi*, and he has ill-advisedly followed Murray on the relation of Erasmus and Luther rather than the competent lead of Preserved Smith. The last chapter, on indulgences and theses, is the brightest of the book, and we may pleasurably anticipate as vigorous a discussion of the years which followed 1517 in a succeeding volume.

ERNEST W. NELSON.

*The Rise of the Spanish Empire in the Old World and in the New.*

By ROGER BIGELOW MERRIMAN, Professor of History in Harvard University. Volume III. *The Emperor*. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. xxiv, 695. \$5.50.)

To the history of no European country have Americans made a more distinguished contribution than to that of Spain. Speaking of the work of Prescott, Ticknor, Lea, and Motley, Fueter attributes this interest in Spain to three causes: to the large part played by that nation in exploring and colonizing the New World; to the love of the American public for the sensational; and to the apparent fact that Spain furnished the most piquant and flattering contrast to American freedom and toleration, being herself regarded as a horrible example of the evils of the union of church and state in persecution. While there is much truth in Fueter's judgment of the older generation, there has now arisen a school of younger men who are influenced not at all by the second and third of the above-mentioned motives, but are moved solely by a desire to throw light on an imperfectly illuminated page of man's story. At the head of this younger school stands Professor Merriman, whose work on the Spanish Empire rivals the achievements of the great predecessors so generously and so justly praised by him.

The rise of the most powerful and extensive empire seen in Europe since the fall of Rome culminated in the reign of Charles V. The universal monarchy disclaimed by him was almost thrust upon him, and



continually shimmered before the eyes of his counsellors (see the letter of Gattinara to Erasmus published in the *Bulletin Hispanique*, Bordeaux, 1924, XXVI. 27 ff.). Indeed it was openly advocated, as a policy, by Georg Sauermann as early as 1520, was unfavorably discussed by Erasmus, whose dialogue *Charon* was perhaps suggested by Sauermann, and was again defended in a reply to Erasmus by Juan de Valdés.

In several respects Professor Merriman shows that current judgments of Charles's success have been warped by retroactive knowledge of his son Philip's failure. Between Spain and the Netherlands there was, for example, not the later hostility but, throughout Charles's reign, there were good relations based on common loyalty and on mutually profitable commerce. By far the greater part of the foreign commerce of the Netherlands, indeed, remained in the hands of the merchants of the Iberian peninsula down to the very end of the reign (see L. Van der Essen in *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale d'Archéologie de Belgique*, 1920). But the policies of Charles laid the foundation for the subsequent collapse. By his insistence on docility and abject submission on the part of his officers, the Emperor weeded out initiative and energy, and thus crippled Spain in competition with freer rivals (Merriman, p. 147). Moreover his ambition set for his subjects a harder task than they could perform, and drained both their wealth and their manhood to supply fuel for his wars (p. 189). In fact, the author sees Pavia as the climax of the Emperor's success; thereafter set in the slow processes of decay.

The most interesting and valuable chapter, and also the one based most largely on unpublished sources, is the twenty-third, on internal development. The author, having perused the minutes of the Council and the journals of the Cortes of Castile, has drawn from them a body of valuable information brilliantly illuminating the constitution and social development of sixteenth-century Spain. The composition and duties of the various governing bodies, the administration of justice, the national finances, the economic condition of the people, the army, navy, education, culture, literature, and art are all treated with a wealth of knowledge and of insight. It is tempting, but impossible in a short notice, to give examples.

The story of the Hispanic conquest of the New World loses little of romance and gains much in accuracy in the hands of Professor Merriman. He thinks the principal key-notes of the Emperor's policy were the Christianization of the natives and the acquisition of revenue (p. 652). He suggests that the tales of wealth seized by the conquistadores, and also the accounts of their cruelty to the Indians, have been exaggerated.

It is the embarrassment of the reviewer, and the just grievance of the reviewed, that books must usually be criticized by those who know far less about their subject-matter than does the author. In the small field in which I have been able to test Professor Merriman's work I have found it sound and true; but I may in concluding raise a few points in which a slight revision may be desirable. When he quotes Pace as call-



ing Charles "but an idiot" (p. 11), he should not have interpreted the word as "imbecile", but should have noted that "idiot" then had a meaning nearer the original Greek—"layman" or "private man not a specialist". He himself gives an example of this use on page 176, and I could furnish others. To the accounts of the first treasure sent from Mexico (p. 45) might be added that of Albert Dürer, who saw it at Brussels. The notice of Sauermann (p. 58) errs in the year that he was rector at Bologna (not 1517 but 1513-1514) and in remarking that it was an unusual honor for one so young. At Bologna the rectors were elected not by the masters (as north of the Alps) but by the students from their own number, and Sauermann was actually rector for the term before he took in course his degree of LL.D. The date of Charles's declaration against Luther was not April 17, but April 19 (see document in my *Luther's Correspondence*, I. 530). Further light on Lutheranism in Spain in 1521 might be found in Gachard, *Correspondance de Charles-Quint et d'Adrien VI.* (1859), p. 244; in Pasolini, *Adriano VI.*, p. 25; and in Kalkoff, *Anfänge der Gegenreformation in den Niederlanden*, I. 43. The impression given by Professor Merriman (p. 245) that Frundsberg marched to Rome is incorrect. Just before the sack he had a stroke of apoplexy and returned to Germany to die. Another original source for the sack of Rome (p. 246) is the *Warhafftige und kurtze Bericht* described in the *Bibliotheca Belgica*. As Benalcázar is several times mentioned, it is interesting to note that a patent granting him mining rights, signed by Charles at Worms, March 6, 1521, is now in the Wellesley College library.

PRESERVED SMITH.

*Das Schweizerische Täufermennonitentum: ein Soziologischer Bericht.* Von Dr. oec. publ. ERNST H. CORRELL. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). 1925. Pp. x, 145, 4 plates. Unbound 6 M.; bound 8 M.)

THANKS to the thorough work of Cornelius, Loserth, Bossert, Egli, Burrage, Newman, and others, it is now known that there were two totally distinct types of "Anabaptists", of independent origin and quite unlike in character, the peaceful Swiss type who came first, and the radical, revolutionary type, such as those of Münster. The story that Dr. Correll tells is the story of the peaceful Swiss Brethren, those thorough-going reformers who left the immediate Zwinglian circle in Zurich to establish a "pure Church of believers only, according to the teaching and example of Christ and the apostles". He traces their history from the beginning in 1523-1525, through a century of bitter and annihilating persecution to ultimate wholesale emigration (really deportation) from their native valleys in Bern down the Rhine to Alsace, the Palatinate, and Baden, and finally to Pennsylvania, a movement which extended over the entire century following the Thirty Years' War. In addition to telling

this little-known portion of history in a thorough and objective manner, Dr. Correll describes in detail the essential character of the group, entering into a thorough discussion of their religious beliefs, their ethical and social ideals, their attitudes toward the "world", the state, marriage, property, "business", in fact their whole religio-socio-ethical orientation.

Purely as a survey of the early and later history of the Swiss Brethren (later called Mennonites after their Dutch and North German co-religionists who followed Menno Simons) the book is highly valuable, indeed indispensable to the student in the field. As Professor Koehler of Zurich says, it is the latest authoritative work in its field, bringing the discussion up to date. The abundant foot-notes, often as extensive as the text, with frequent citations from original sources, bear adequate testimony to the thorough character of the work and reveal the hand of a scholar who has mastered his material. Many sources were used which have hitherto been unused, indeed unknown to most students in the field.

But the book is more than a historical survey of an interesting Reformation sect. It is also a fruitful study in the sociology of religion by a pupil of Max Weber and Troeltsch, done quite in the spirit of that school. The sociological problem arises from the fact that the Swiss Brethren, who were exclusively farmers, speedily became leaders in agricultural progress wherever they went, and the author set himself to answer the question whether the unique economic achievements of the group were due to its religious and ethical system, the thesis which Max Weber developed in his analysis of the relation of Calvinism to the development of modern capitalism.

This discussion, which occupies the second half of the book, portrays the Alsatian and Palatine Mennonite "model farmer", sought by princes and rulers "to improve the state of agriculture", whose epoch-making contributions are in no small measure responsible for the high state of modern German agriculture. Pennsylvanians are aware of similar valuable contributions of these same Swiss Mennonite immigrants to Pennsylvania from 1700 on. It is not without reason that Lancaster County, the centre of a Mennonite and Amish community of over 20,000, is one of the garden spots of the land.

It might be added that those interested in the strictly religious conscientious objectors of the last war, who were chiefly these Swiss Mennonites of Pennsylvania and their descendants, will here find much light on the origin and nature of the thorough-going Biblical pacifism of the group, which has characterized it for four centuries, and which finally led the Swiss authorities to drive them from their homes on the long journey which ultimately brought them across the seas to America.

Complete bibliographies and critical apparatus enhance the value of this compact little volume.

HAROLD S. BENDER.

*Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France des Origines à la Suppression, 1528-1762.* Par le P. HENRI FOUQUERAY, S.J. Tomes IV. and V. *Sous le Ministère de Richelieu.* (Paris: Bureau des Études. 1924. Pp. xiii, 442; 478. 50 fr.)

WITH the fifth volume, taking the history of the Jesuits in France to 1645, the task assigned to Father Fouqueray has been completed; another scholar is already preparing a continuation of the story until 1762. Though the two volumes here under review accumulate, like their predecessors, a vast number of facts, they are tinctured with superstition, saturated with prejudice, and diluted with a quantity of trivial detail.

What can one say of a work written in the twentieth century that accepts as facts miracles, special providences, and demonic possession? In describing the missions of the Jesuits among the Huguenots the author tells us that "their zeal was more than once seconded by striking prodigies" (IV. 260). The epidemic of religious mania that broke out among the nuns at Loudon in 1632 was then naturally attributed to black magic and possession by devils, and this view of the matter is accepted by the modern historian who tells us (V. 269) that "the facts of supernatural diabolism recounted in the Gospels oblige us to admit the possibility of possession in general", and who then naïvely relates as actual history the pranks of the devils Leviathan and Balam on being exorcized by the Jesuits! Among the other benefits which the author attributes to the work of his society is the very doubtful one of the birth of Louis XIV. He leaves it ambiguous, however, whether this was due to the prayers of the order at the tomb of St. Ignatius or to the skillful measures taken by Father Caussin and his tool Mlle. de La Fayette to revive in the heart of Louis XIII. a love for his long neglected wife (V. 190). According to the secular historian, Mariéjol, the begetting of the Grand Monarch was in fact due to a storm that drove his father to take refuge in the apartments of the queen.

But Father Fouqueray has not only made the sacrifice of his intellect, demanded by Loyola, but that of his candor as well. His work is an apology, not an impartial history. He writes in the spirit, though not in the rococo style, of the *Imago Primi Saeculi*, in praise of which he quotes the opinion of the general of the order that it was a perfect work and worthy of posterity (V. 197), while he excuses its exaggerations by attributing them to the taste of the age. But it was a contemporary, Antoine Arnauld, who blamed the *Imago* for representing the Jesuits as "born with their cassocks on, perfect, pure, and good as angels".

The quarrel of the Jesuits and the Jansenists has been so consistently presented from the Jansenist side ever since the incomparable *Provinciales*, that there is ample room for a history of the affair from another point of view. But the extreme and palpable bias of Father Fouqueray will only confirm the reader in the impression that the Jesuit cause must have been a totally bad one. Not only does he omit all references to the moral

theology of the casuists, but he attributes every ugly motive, and no others, to their opponents. For him Saint-Cyran is "a monster of bad faith" (IV. 93) who demoralized the nuns of Port-Royal by insinuating heresy and self-opinion into their innocent breasts. Jansen himself is said to have been actuated only by spite against the order to which he had once applied for admission and by which he had been rejected. His book is called "a virulent satire on the Jesuits"—which it certainly is not. In truth the Jansenists, except Pascal and Racine, were narrow-minded, puritanical fanatics, with much sincerity and with much courage in attacking the depraved but popular theology of Jesuitry. The Grand Siècle was prepared, not as Fouqueray says (V. 463) by the Jesuits, nor as Sainte-Beuve intimates by the Jansenists, but by the mutually destructive warfare of the two, after which those honest men, the Libertines, came to their own.

Father Fouqueray naturally praises the schools of his order, and justifiably dwells upon the large numbers of their pupils and upon the roll of famous names among them. But he is constitutionally unable to allow any motives to their critics except spite and jealousy. The constant and bitter opposition of the universities, especially of Paris, was founded, he says, on no cause whatever except envy and the spirit of monopoly.

But though superstition may be discounted and bias allowed for, it is difficult to find anything of value in Fouqueray, apart from a few minute details, because of a third fault, the inability to see the forest for the trees. Small beer (if one may change the metaphor thus abruptly) has often been the refreshment offered by Clio to her guests, but seldom have such hogsheads of it been drawn as by Father Fouqueray. A meticulous attention to unimportant men, to trivial quarrels, to tempests in long forgotten teacups, completely excludes any large or philosophic view of what the Jesuit order stood for in the history of either France or the Church. The brief treatment of the Society by Harnack or by Böhmer has more of real value than have the heavy tomes of Fouqueray. The final impression one gets from his account is that the Jesuits had no character except that of an insipid saintliness and no policy but that of constant defense against perpetual, but unaccountable, persecution and hatred. The title of one chapter, *Une Suite d'Affaires Désagréables*, might well be the title of the whole work. It is enough to make one lose all interest in history.

PRESERVED SMITH.

*The Short Journal and Itinerary Journals of George Fox.* Edited by NORMAN PENNEY, LL.D., F.S.A. Published for Friends' Historical Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. (Cambridge, England: University Press; Philadelphia: Friends' Book Store. 1925. Pp. xxxv, 403. 15 s.)

THIS well-edited and handsome volume contains three important and hitherto unprinted source-documents for the history of George Fox and

early Quakerism. They are: first, the Short Journal composed by Fox while he lay in Lancaster jail and covering the period from 1648 to 1663/1664; second, the Itinerary Journal running from 1681 (omitting 1682) to the death of Fox in 1690; third, the Haistwell Diary, kept by Edward Haistwell, a travelling companion of Fox in 1677-1678 while the latter was visiting Holland, and comprising a few pages kept by Fox himself while Haistwell lay ill in Embden. In addition, there are 107 pages of closely printed notes giving a vast amount of information concerning persons and places prominent in the early days of Quakerism, and a copious index.

It cannot be said that the book adds much to our knowledge of the personality of George Fox—here as in the *Journal* he is always “stiff as a tree, and pure as a bell”—but it makes large contributions to our information concerning his diversified activities. Especially in the Itinerary Journal, the scene of which is laid mainly in and about London, we have record not only of “meetings” but also of innumerable conferences with various persons upon all sorts of subjects. It stirs our pity that an old man, battered by mobs and imprisonments, should have been so interminably harassed about trifles. We trace also the gradual failing of his strength in the frequent references to his growing habit of lying down to rest after a meeting as also of entering one after it had begun and leaving before it was finished. At the same time, we have abundant indications of the reverence in which he was held by devoted friends and followers, whose hospitable doors were always open for his welcome coming. Although his wife could be with him only on few and brief visits, he was not lonely, for troops of friends surrounded him, and after the storm and stress of his early years, it is pleasant to see that at eventide the light shone sweet and bright around him even as it had shone within him during days of hardship and peril.

These sources were plainly used in the preparation of the *Journal*, edited by Ellwood and censored by a committee of Friends. Unfortunately, however, for one whose interest is in George Fox, that *Journal* was bowdlerized in the interest of edification. Not until the Cambridge edition of 1911 was the manuscript printed without omissions and alterations. It now appears that the manuscript itself also had been affected by the same tendency. The outstanding problem is how Fox developed from the maudlin enthusiast shown in Honthorst's picture of 1654, into the benign, sedate, and sagacious leader depicted in the Lely portrait, if indeed the latter be authentic. That such a change occurred is certain, for the youth mooning about England in the early 'fifties is quite unlike the wise organizer of the 'eighties. This is a psychological problem which the treatment to which the *Journal* has been subjected makes almost insoluble. Not to speak of the fact that the first sixteen pages of the manuscript have disappeared, so that we can never know what account they gave of his youth and first “openings”, comparison of the 1911 edition with its predecessors proves that the latter left out in printing much

which would have been offensive to the sobriety of Friends and perhaps prejudicial to the Society, and now the *Short Journal* is found to contain more of the same sort of material than the manuscript of the long *Journal* itself. A single example will serve for illustration. In the *Short Journal* (p. 17) we read that after spending the night at an inn, near Carlisle, in 1653, Fox "was moved to tell the man of the house that I was the son of God". Not long afterwards, before the magistrates, "They asked me if I were the Son of God, I said yes. They asked me if I had seen God's face, I said yes" (*Short Journal*, p. 32). Naturally, such utterances caused trouble both at the time and afterwards. In a note upon the first passage, the editor says "It is interesting to notice that in A [an early copy] the words originally written were 'the son of God', but at some later but quite early date a capital letter A has obscured the 'the' and at the apex of the letter appears a small a" (p. 279). Both passages are lacking in the Ellwood and Cambridge editions of the *Journal*. In Fox's letter to Cromwell (1654), the Cambridge edition of the *Journal* (p. 161) has "From him whom the world calls George Fox, who is the son of God"; in the Ellwood edition the letter is summarized and the objectionable clause does not appear. This is only one instance out of many which prove that in addition to the psychological there is also a literary problem arising out of the Fox documents like that presented by the Synoptic Gospels or, better, the Acts of the Apostles. Is it too much to hope that some young Friend trained in the methods of the higher criticism of the New Testament will turn his attention to this literary problem of like character, to the advantage both of our knowledge of Fox and also of his own New Testament study?

W. W. FENN.

*Robert Walpole et la Politique de Fleury, 1731-1742.* Par PAUL VAUCHER, Docteur ès Lettres, Professeur à l'Université de Londres. (Paris: Plon-Nourrit. 1924. Pp. xi, 473. 25 fr.)

*La Crise du Ministère Walpole en 1733-1734.* Par PAUL VAUCHER, Docteur ès Lettres, Professeur à l'Université de Londres. (*Ibid.*, 1924. Pp. 70. 7 fr.)

A DEFINITIVE biography of Sir Robert Walpole remains to be written. Coxe's well-documented work is a century and a quarter old; Morley's excellent interpretation is but a sketch and is not based upon a critical study of the sources; Brisco has considered only the economic side; the efforts of J. M. Robertson and Ewald are too superficial; the recent works of Chance and Michael while thorough and scholarly, cover only the early portion of his career. Professor Vaucher's study, therefore, treats of a period in Anglo-French history which badly needed re-examination.

The two monographs are really one study, covering the most fruitful decade of Walpole's career. The works are critical, scholarly, and well written. They are well documented, and the author is equally at home in



the sources, whether printed or manuscript. He seems thoroughly familiar with even the more obscure secondary works and is most liberal in ascribing credit to the earlier workers in his field. His bibliography is a model which should be called to the attention of future aspirants for the doctorate in America; students of Walpole and his times will find it invaluable. The discussion of the manuscript sources in British and French archives is especially illuminating. Despite the abundance of materials consulted, the author still sighs for the personal letters of Walpole, Bolingbroke, and Chauvelin, which seem to have disappeared.

Future historians of the age of Walpole will be grateful for this penetrating study, which errs only on the side of caution. It is a painstaking synthesis of the foreign and domestic history of Great Britain and the diplomacy of Fleury. It is at once an illustration of the difficulty of such a task and of its great value when successfully done. Dr. Vaucher shows clearly both the interdependence of domestic affairs and diplomacy, and the necessity for a profound knowledge of the intricacies of British politics, if one is to understand British foreign policy. He has used foreign archives to throw additional light upon English domestic politics, and reveals the great importance of the despatches of ambassadors at the court of St. James to their home governments in the study of British domestic affairs.

The account of negotiations during the War of the Polish Succession shows eighteenth-century diplomacy at its worst. The abortive efforts of the two maritime powers to mediate between Hapsburg and Bourbon suggest that Cardinal Fleury outwitted Walpole by arranging with Austria the preliminaries of peace without consulting him. For the moment, peace seems to have increased the English premier's prestige, of which he made the most, whereas in reality Great Britain's abstention from sharing in the war had permitted France to acquire the preponderant place in European affairs.

The fall of the bellicose Chauvelin, whom Fleury had put in charge of foreign affairs, improved for a while Anglo-French relations, as Chauvelin was openly hostile to Walpole, who attempted, apparently in vain, to buy his support. The sources of irritation were too deep, however, to be eradicated, despite the definitely pacific tendencies of Walpole and Fleury. Walpole did hold off hostilities with Spain for a year, but public opinion, sedulously wrought upon by the Opposition, finally brought on war, not only with Spain but eventually with France. Professor Vaucher suggests that the Duke of Newcastle undermined Walpole's efforts toward peace with Spain and later wrecked Fleury's attempts to reconcile England and Spain (pp. 285, 296). England however feared, and with good reason, the steadily increasing part played by France in the colonial and commercial spheres, for Fleury was tremendously interested in both (pp. 340, 352). Walpole, however, feared even more the possibility of a Bourbon Family Compact and the union of the French and Spanish navies, which might give to the enemy the mastery of the Mediterranean and the



English Channel (pp. 325, 340). The final chapters show how the election of 1741, the neutrality of Hanover, and the growing war fever helped to force Walpole from office.

The small monograph contains a clear statement of Walpole's struggle over the excise of 1733 and an interesting account of the election of 1734. Walpole is credited with seeing the future importance of commerce to the crown, as a source of revenue.

Mr. J. F. Chance indicated, in a recent work, that George I., not Walpole, controlled British foreign policy after the death of Stanhope. Dr. Vaucher's researches here indicate that Fleury's diplomacy was more successful than that of Walpole. The reviewer is slightly disappointed, because the author has remained so silent on the controversial Family Compact of 1733, and he dares to raise the question whether there may not have been a gentlemen's agreement between Walpole and Fleury throughout the period! If so, it might explain the fall of Chauvelin and the second flight of Bolingbroke.

The work under review is a notable contribution to the subject. It is scholarly without being pedantic, critical without being dull.

WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN.

*A Prime Minister and his Son.* From the Correspondence of the Third Earl of Bute and of Lt.-General the Hon. Sir Charles Stuart, K.B. Edited by the Hon. Mrs. E. STUART WORTLEY, C.B.E. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1925. Pp. x, 357. \$6.00.)

MRS. STUART WORTLEY has done a good service in giving to the world these letters which have lain so long neglected in the possession of Lord Bute's descendants at Highcliffe. The result is a book of engaging interest in which, in company with Stuarts, Campbells, Wortleys, and Berties, we look out upon the England of one hundred and fifty years ago. We are regaled by family gossip and the diversions of high life, but are privileged as well to hear grave topics discussed, to sit in council with Lord Amherst in the days of the Gordon riots, and to survey the American campaigns from the vantage-ground of the British headquarters. Indeed the volume is rich in the sort of stuff that history is made of.

John Stuart, third earl of Bute, had a brief and unhappy experience as prime minister. He was not a great man, but he writes as an honest one and his letters suggest political integrity and even patriotic unselfishness. In his retirement he broods bitterly over the outrageous persecution meted out to him and his, and in writing of public affairs his pen is always steeped in gall.

The hero of the book is Charles, the fourth and favorite son of the embittered earl; and his letters portray his military career from his arrival in Boston in 1775 to a few weeks before his death. From 1775 until 1792, the year of Bute's death, we have an interchange of correspondence be-

tween father and son full of discussions of military and public affairs that can hardly fail to throw some new light upon the history of the time. Bute was a fond and proud parent, while to Charles he was not only the kindest and wisest of fathers but "his dearest friend".

Stuart was a brilliant soldier. Perhaps some of his military genius came to him through his Campbell blood, his paternal grandmother being a sister of John, duke of Argyll, who was regarded as a great captain even in the days when Marlborough's fame was at its zenith. He was also the grandson on his mother's side of that brilliant and somewhat eccentric woman, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. There was little of the commonplace in his pedigree or early associations.

We find Stuart landing in America in June, 1775, when he was twenty-two years of age. Earl Percy, then on duty in Boston, was his brother-in-law, and Mrs. Stuart Wortley infers that he came out unattached and secured satisfactory duty in Percy's brigade. But recourse to the Army Lists and reliable regimental authorities prove that he landed in Boston from a belated transport on June 18, as a captain in the 35th Regiment of foot, and that a few days later he was transferred to the command of its grenadier company, succeeding Captain Lyons, who had been killed at Bunker Hill. He purchased his majority in October, and was promoted in 1777 to be lieutenant-colonel of the 26th, or Cameronian, Regiment of foot.

His first letter in this volume is dated Boston July 24, or about five weeks after Bunker Hill. He gives his father a rapid résumé of the political and military events for the two or three months that preceded his arrival. This narrative abounds in curious blunders and exaggerations which his friends Earl Percy or Lord Rawdon might easily have corrected. When he describes the situation in Boston as it came under his personal observation, he is on sure ground, and in a few vivid sentences he gives us a gruesome picture of conditions after Bunker Hill, together with some very trenchant military observations that concern the British headquarters and their methods and plans. Nearly a third of the book is given over to Stuart's subsequent letters from America, covering the period of the Revolution from 1776 to 1780.

Perhaps no blacker picture exists than the one he paints of the incompetence, jealousy, and mismanagement both in the cabinet and in the field, conditions which paralyzed British military effort in America. Perhaps Bute had imparted something of his own pessimism to his son, at all events we read of how the schisms that racked the British headquarters brought about a steady deterioration in the morale and discipline of the army. We are informed, moreover, that gross military misdemeanors, including the looting and maltreatment of the Loyalist population, were by no means confined to the Hessians.

Bute was popularly believed to exercise a clandestine influence upon the king and, as Bute's son, Stuart found himself very much in the confidence of his superiors. The advice and comfort of this stripling were

sought by men in high command, and his letters abound in picturesque and vivid characterizations of Gage, Clinton, Arbuthnot, Percy, and other officers of rank. Clinton makes a pitiable figure in Stuart's narrative and whimpers his way through nearly two years of sombre correspondence. In 1779 the Cameronians were ordered home and then the young colonel seized the opportunity to retire finally from America, that barren field of misadventure in which there were no laurels to be garnered.

For nearly fifteen years Stuart's sword rested in its scabbard, and then he entered upon the glorious period of his career. Given the chief military command in the Mediterranean, he captured Corsica and Minorca, and secured Portugal and Sicily against invasion. The closing chapters of the book consist largely of war-time letters he received from such comrades as Nelson, Jervis, Abercromby, and Sir John Moore, and these leave no doubt as to the admiration and esteem in which Lieutenant-General the Honorable Sir Charles Stuart, K.B., was held by his brothers in arms. He died on May 25, 1801. Only nine years had intervened between the burial of the prime minister among his Scottish hills and the interment of his son as a national hero in the aisles of Westminster Abbey.

Mrs. Stuart Wortley's editing is modest, restrained, and intelligent throughout. Her text seems singularly free from errors in transcription, although one exception must be noted, the name of General Haldimand appearing repeatedly as "Haldinald". The reader, on laying aside this book, can hardly fail to echo the sentiment expressed by Sir Rennell Rodd in his Introduction: "It is to be hoped that this installment will be followed by the result of further researches in the Highcliffe Archives."

*The Making of Modern Italy.* By ARRIGO SOLMI. With an Introduction by Arundel del Re, M.A. (London: E. Benn; New York: Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. xxi, 231. 12 s. 6d.)

In this brief treatise we are presented with an English version of the author's *Il Risorgimento Italiano, 1814-1918*. This was published in Italy in 1919 by the Federazione Italiana delle Biblioteche Popolari of Milan as a volume in its *Biblioteca di Cultura Popolare*. Such auspices, and the division of the original text into "lessons" for the convenience of the general reader, seeking to acquire "nozioni di storia" (the subtitle of the series), are indications of its scope that are entirely lacking in the title-page or preface of the English translation. It is hard to forgive the American publishers of foreign books for such omissions. The translation does not embody a revision of the text. This is indicated by the reappearance of minor misstatements of fact that were pointed out by the Italian reviews, and the reaffirmation of the myth of the Council of Potsdam of July 5, 1914.

Professor Solmi, well known as the author of *La Storia del Diritto Italiano*, does not write as a specialist in the Risorgimento, but presents a sketch of the last century of Italian history in the light of the triumph of

Italy as a participant in the Great War. In this victory as a reassertion of national ideals he sees the true culmination of the Risorgimento. Such value as the book has for non-Italian readers of history will be found in its perspective. It was one of the first books to appear in response to the obvious necessity of recasting the history of the Risorgimento in the light of recent events. In the older works the Risorgimento was represented as an epic that closed in gloom with the death of its protagonists, or as an isolated triumph of the national will, ending with unification; and where these works have recently been brought up to date, they have too often been histories of the unification movement pieced out with an uninspired supplement. Professor Solmi gets the nation united and the Kingdom of Italy launched on its independent career in the first half of his volume. He sees the moment towards which the whole century points in Vittorio Veneto, when, after a period of exhaustion, disillusionment, and confusion that naturally followed a brilliant but perhaps too lucky struggle for unity, the Italian nation resumed the march in the fulfilment of the ideals that the author conceives as representing its historic destiny.

It would be inappropriate to subject an essay such as Professor Solmi's to scholarly criticism. It is not a scientific study but an essay in interpretation; and the value of its theories as theories can only be tested by time and research. Professor Solmi's idealistic doctrine that it is the historic mission of Italy, having vindicated the principle of free nationality, to perform the moderating and stabilizing function in the life of Europe, represents a persistent element of Italian idealism, asserting itself in Petrarch's

I' vo gridando: pace, pace, pace,

and powerfully stimulated by the influence of Mazzini in the last century. Professor Solmi's thesis that Italy, in spite of temporary weakness and bewilderment, was acting in obedience to this ideal of pacification in her relations with the Triple Alliance and the Entente, in her occupation of Massowah, and the war with Turkey, will certainly have to be proved to be generally accepted.

KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD.

*Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette, 1871-1914.* Sammlung der Diplomatischen Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes. Im Auftrage des Auswärtigen Amtes herausgegeben von JOHANNES LEPSIUS, ALBRECHT MENDELSSOHN BARTHOLDY, FRIEDRICH THIMME. Volumes XIX.-XXV. (Berlin: Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte. 1925. Pp. 674; 698; 689; 522; 568; 500; 705.)

THESE seven volumes of the monumental German diplomatic collection cover approximately the years from 1904 to 1908. They begin with the Russo-Japanese War and its diplomatic repercussions in Europe. It is

often said that Germany did her best to push Russia into this mad adventure, in order to free her own frontier from the pressure of Russian troops and in order to weaken the Franco-Russian combination. The documents show that this is not altogether true. There was a divergence of opinion between the German Foreign Office and the Kaiser. As early as July, 1902, Holstein drew up a memorandum pointing out that Germany must not encourage Russia to expect that Germany would protect Russia's rear in Europe in case the Tsar became involved with Japan over Manchuria. This might lead to a world war which would be fought largely upon the sea and which promised economic disaster to Germany and little prospect of gains. Therefore Germany must pursue strict neutrality in case of a Russo-Japanese war (XIX. i, 5-7). This remained the policy of the Wilhelmstrasse. The Kaiser, on the other hand, was obsessed with the "Yellow Peril" spectre, and genuinely believed it was Russia's duty to civilization to check Japan. "This is the greatest danger which threatens the white race, Christianity, and European civilization", he told Bülow. "If the Russians yield further to the Japanese, in twenty years the Yellow Race will be in Moscow and Posen. . . . It is a shame for France to leave her ally in the lurch and for England and the United States to sympathize with Japan. We must call the Tsar's attention to the greatness of the Yellow Peril, which he does not yet understand" (XIX. i, 63). He wanted to strengthen the Tsar's hand against Japan and England. He and his military advisers believed that the Russians would win in case of war. Later also, even after Japan's initial victories, when President Roosevelt privately suggested in August, 1904, peace terms which America and Germany should attempt to bring about "in case General Kuropatkin's army is destroyed and Port Arthur falls", the Kaiser commented, "Very naïve, without an understanding of the Russians"; and added, "One should not begin to divide the bear's skin before he has been shot" (XIX. ii, 537). It was not until after the battle of Tsushima ten months later that he was convinced that Russia's defeat was hopelessly complete and consequently advised the Tsar to accept Roosevelt's mediation.

Bülow, on the other hand, agreed with Holstein in wishing to be very cautious about giving any encouragement to Russia; he wanted to avoid all semblance of anything which might antagonize England. On January 4, 1904, on the eve of the war, Bülow discovered that "Willy" had written "Nicky" a letter which departed widely from the cautious draft prepared by the Foreign Office; it added, among other things, for the Tsar's encouragement, the opinion that "It is evident to every unbiassed mind that Korea must and will be Russian". Bülow at once remonstrated. He advised stopping the delivery of the letter and sending a special courier with another in its place. But the Kaiser refused, adding petulantly that there must be a limit to "the continual revision of my private correspondence with the Tsar. . . . It would make the Tsar distrustful if he had the idea that my 'private letters' were drafted in the Imperial

Chancery" (XIX. i, 89). In spite of this episode, however, the Willy-Nicky letters were usually laid before the Foreign Office, and were often drafted by it. But there were several occasions where this was not the case. They need to be restudied carefully in the light of these new documents before one draws conclusions as to the extent to which they represent German foreign policy.

This same divergence between the Kaiser's pro-Russian proclivities in 1904-1905 and Bülow's fear of antagonizing England is revealed in connection with many other matters. "Willy" urged upon "Nicky" a Russo-German arrangement for guaranteeing Danish neutrality and closing the Baltic in case of war. But Bülow wished to leave all initiative in such plans to the King of Denmark, lest news of it leak out and arouse British wrath (XIX. i, 65-91). Again, at Björkö, the Kaiser on his own responsibility ventured to modify slightly the text of the secret draft treaty sent him from the Foreign Office, by limiting its application to a conflict "in Europe". Hereupon Bülow threatened to resign. The Kaiser was amazed and terribly upset. He had just written with his own hand a letter filling six printed pages and setting forth with the highest emotional enthusiasm all the extraordinary advantages secured by the Björkö Treaty—the prospective consolidation of the Triple and Dual Alliances into a defensive five-power Continental league, the Tsar's promise to accept the Alsace-Lorraine question as a closed incident, and the prevention of a Franco-Russo-English entente. "Thanks to the grace of God, Björkö has become a turning point in the history of Europe" (XIX. ii, 463; also 458-498 *passim*). Bülow's threatened resignation was a stunning and unexpected blow. But the Kaiser could not part with him. He offered to get the Tsar to change the treaty back to its original form, and made an appeal which Bülow could not refuse:

You are worth 100,000 times more to me and the Fatherland than all the treaties in the world. . . . Do not forget that you persuaded me personally against my will to go to Tangiers for the sake of the success of your Morocco policy. It was to please you, for the sake of the Fatherland, that I landed, mounted a strange horse in spite of my equestrian disability due to my shrivelled left arm, and might have come within a hair of losing my life, . . . because you wanted it and your policy was to profit by it! And now you want simply to leave me in the lurch. . . . No, my friend, stay in office and with me, and we will work further in common together *ad maiorem Germaniae gloriam*. . . . After the receipt of this letter telegraph me "All right", so that I shall know you will stay. Because the morning after the arrival of your letter of resignation would no longer find your Emperor alive. Think of my poor wife and children! (XIX. ii, 497-498).

The first Morocco crisis and the Algeiras Conference fill the greater part of two big double volumes (XX. i, ii; XXI. i, ii). As correctly intimated in the quotation above, it was not the Kaiser, but Bülow (and Holstein) who chiefly determined Germany's Morocco policy. The



Kaiser, whose fears and antipathies were centred largely on England, personally preferred a policy of conciliation toward France and of closer relations with her Russian ally. He was opposed to acquiring Moroccan territory or making a naval demonstration in Moroccan waters. But Bülow early adopted the attitude that Germany could not accept Delcassé's attempt to monopolize and "Tunify" Morocco without consulting Germany. It meant a double blow to Germany—a blow to her growing commerce in Morocco, and a blow to her dignity as a Great Power. A few days before the publication of the Anglo-French convention of April 8, 1904, concerning Egypt and Morocco, Delcassé had mentioned the subject informally to the German ambassador in Paris (XX. i, 5-7). Aside from this, Germany was not formally notified or consulted about a treaty which threatened seriously to interfere with her rights in Morocco. England at once proceeded to negotiate with Germany as to the new status created by the Anglo-French convention in Egypt (XX. i, 121-165), but Delcassé did not do likewise as to Morocco. Bülow felt that Germany had been slighted. To be sure, in a Reichstag speech, he had attempted, as usual, to put a good face on a bad matter by appearing to welcome any agreements between France and England which removed causes of friction between themselves. But he early determined to hold to Germany's rights under the international Morocco treaty of 1880 and ignore the Anglo-French convention until Delcassé should offer to discuss it. For months he and his ambassador in Paris preserved a studiously sphinx-like silence, waiting for France to open negotiations. The Kaiser's visit to Tangiers (XX. i, 235-289) was a hint that Germany was still waiting. Finally, as Bülow calculated, the French Cabinet became alarmed at Germany's persistent, impassive silence, and Rouvier let the German government know by unofficial indirect means that he would be willing to drop Delcassé. The exciting details of this internal French situation, about which the French Yellow Book on Morocco says nothing, are here revealed at length (XX. ii, 344-409). More important perhaps than the overthrow of Delcassé was the English conviction that Germany was trying to disrupt the Anglo-French *entente cordiale*. This was not really Bülow's main object (though most writers assert the contrary), but it resulted in transforming the Morocco conflict into almost more of an Anglo-German than a Franco-German quarrel. Whether England really offered France something more than *diplomatic* support in June, 1905, as alleged by Delcassé, Chaumié, Émile Bourgeois, Poincaré, Eckardstein, and others, but categorically denied by Lansdowne and Asquith and virtually by Gooch, is not wholly clear. At any rate, Bülow seriously suspected as much, and the Kaiser was convinced of it (XX. ii, 615-698).

Fortunately President Roosevelt stepped in and smoothed out the Morocco quarrel (XX. ii, 521-597; XXI. *passim*), with the same vigor, common-sense, frankness, and modesty as had enabled him to bring Russia and Japan to sign the Peace of Portsmouth (XIX. ii, 529-630). The general lines of his worthy part in these two affairs are now familiar



from such publications as the biography by J. B. Bishop and the new Roosevelt-Lodge Correspondence, but many new and interesting details are to be found in the despatches of Speck von Sternburg, who was greatly liked and trusted by the President. After the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1905 (XIX. ii, 633-642) and the conclusion of the Russo-Japanese and Franco-Japanese treaties in the summer of 1907, the Kaiser became alarmed lest these treaties might contain secret articles which might threaten the *status quo* and "open door" in China. He therefore urged a German-Chinese *entente* which he hoped the United States would join. The project came to nothing, since Roosevelt thought the time not ripe and he knew the opposition to be expected from the Senate. But as an indication of his views and his cordial relations with the German ambassador the following (condensed) statement to "Speck" is interesting:

On my return from Cuba I took you straight to Montauk Camp for a thorough inspection of all the forces. I remember your words: "Even the best race-horse will fail if thorough training is lacking." Since those days you know it has been my main effort to introduce the best system of training in the army. I have failed. If Japan invades America using powerful forces, our army will first suffer a crushing blow. This lesson will produce a thorough military organization; after this has been achieved, Japan's army will be annihilated if she has left it in America, and America will take her revenge.

I have discussed with you the deeply confidential sides of these great questions because no foreign representative has ever held the trust of the people as you do. The advice you gave us during and after the war between China and Japan has proved to be the best advice the country ever received (XXV. i, 73).

It is impossible more than to mention a few of the most important topics to which chapters are devoted: the Balkan question, 1904-1907, and the futile attempts at Macedonian reform (XXII.); the second Hague Peace Conference (XXIII. i; ii, 297-397); the North Sea and Baltic conventions of 1907-1908 (XXIII. ii, 463-568); the Anglo-German naval rivalry and *Daily Telegraph* affair (XXIV. 3-210); Casablanca and the Franco-German Morocco convention of 1909 (XXIV. 213-500); the Anglo-Russian *entente* of 1907 and Bagdad railway questions (XXV. i); and the renewed rivalry between Austria and Russia in the Balkans, which was marked by the ambitions of Aehrenthal and Izvolski and which was made more acute by the Young Turk revolution (XXV. ii).

Volumes XXVI. to XXIX. of this invaluable collection of diplomatic documents, which have already been published but have not reached the reviewer, cover the years from 1908-1911. It is expected that by the coming summer the whole work will be completed in thirty-seven volumes, bringing the documents down to July, 1914, to the point where the Kautsky Documents begin.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

*Germany.* By GEORGE P. GOOCH. [The Modern World, edited by the Right Hon. H. A. L. Fisher, M.P.] (London: E. Benn; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1925. Pp. xi, 360. 15 s.; \$3.00.)

It is a pleasure to begin this review by calling attention to its subtitle. This volume by Professor Gooch is one of a series called *The Modern World*, under the editorship of H. A. L. Fisher. The return of Professor Fisher to Oxford and the editorship of this series is an indication that one who was an ornament to British historical scholarship a decade ago has abandoned the vicissitudes of political life to devote himself to education rather than to Lloyd George.

For the volume on Germany there could be no happier choice than Professor Gooch. His selection is one the Germans would have approved, although parts of this volume will not wholly please them.

What Professor Gooch has attempted is first a swift sketch (23 pp.) of Germany before Bismarck, taking off at Westphalia, but emphasizing the years after the battle of Jena. The same compression enables him to cover the Bismarck era from 1862 to 1890 (22 pp.). Three brief chapters bring us from the dropping of the old pilot to 1914 (64 pp.).

There are just two things that can be said about this achievement of spanning 1648 to 1914 in one hundred and ten pages. The first is that no one could have done it better and no one would have done it in the same way. And that is real commendation. It permits me to say that even a Liberal must confess to-day that the German Confederation after 1815 with all its faults was as strong as the time and circumstances permitted and the humiliation of Prussia at Olmütz in 1850 put Prussia and William I. in a state of mind to accept Bismarck and the blood-and-iron policy of ending the Austro-Prussian dualism in Germany. And in the budgetless years was it not Bismarck and the king rather than the Prussian Diet that stood on the letter of the constitution? Reducing Schleswig-Holstein and the Danish War to two sentences is drastic. To mention the Kruger telegram and leave it a name of something that is called important, or to cut the Hague Conferences to a line or two, in view of the threads picked up in later chapters, is a break in one of the main lines of the author's interpretation. He has written elsewhere so excellent an account of the Triple Entente that he here lumps it along with the Yangtze Agreement of 1900 and similar diplomatic episodes.

The second comment on these early pages is that they will be appreciated by those who know German history before 1914, but that the general reader will have much difficulty in making history out of them. It is inevitable. Perhaps, after all, it is kinder to cut off the dog's tail completely than inch by inch. Author, editor, publisher, reader, and reviewer can never agree on the length of the stump and whatever is left serves no dog's purposes.

In other early chapters, *From Poverty to Riches* and the *German Mind*, the author is at his best. The war itself gets two chapters, chiefly on diplomacy during the war. The best part of the book is where it should be, in the treatment of the German national attitude toward Europe before 1914, and in the last half on revolutionary and post-war Germany. It is sane, clear, balanced, strikingly phrased at times, adequate, and eminently just. I can now say what I have wanted to say from the first, and that is that it is the best book about Germany on the eve of 1914 and since the war that has yet been written.

There is no chapter labelled *War Guilt*, but the treatment makes clear just what Germany's diplomatic blunders after Bismarck and the state of mind of the German people contributed as fuel when the spark was struck. The author's view is not far from the moderate statement of Brockdorff-Rantzau at Versailles. He does not let us forget that two kinds of fools can contribute to an explosion, one by parading around with an open powder can, and the other by looking in with a lighted match. This volume may be commended to those who think they have found the man with the match and want him to apologize to the man with the open powder can.

In his consideration of Germany since the war, Professor Gooch indicts Poincaré severely, although one count, that of the Separatist movements in the Rhine area, could have been drawn more sharply. That folly was France's greatest contribution to German post-war unity and nationality. The appreciation of the new constitution and the tribute to Walter Rathenau are excellent. The chapter on economic conditions is less satisfactory than those which deal with currents of thought and problems and prospects in the present German Republic. What may we expect of this Germany which, to quote General Morgan, "sees herself purged of her sins by her sorrows", who "has forgotten the early years of the war with their lust of annexations and only remembers the last of them with their fight for existence"? Has post-war vindictiveness won its Pyrrhic victory over the fathers only to dedicate the children to new and deadlier hatreds? Will the Republic survive? "Self-government", replies the author, "has never formed part of the religion of the German people. The thrones were overturned by the sword of the enemy and the arrows of President Wilson. If they are re-erected it will be because the nation is convinced by bitter experience that a tame parliamentary republic is incompatible with the strength and prosperity of the realm. Thus the future of Germany is inextricably linked to the fortunes of Europe; and the fate of victors and vanquished alike will depend on the capacity of rulers and people to perceive and pursue the abiding interests of our common civilization."

The index, which I attribute to the publishers, is a poor joke with which to conclude such an excellent volume.

GUY STANTON FORD.

*The Government of China, 1644-1911.* By PAO CHAO HSIEH, Ph.D.  
(Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1925. Pp. 414. \$3.00.)

THE author of this treatise is to be congratulated upon justifying, so far as the limits of his effort can, the hopes of those who have awaited from Chinese students in America contributions of historical importance based upon original sources. Dr. Hsieh's volume has been prepared "for the purpose of presenting a clear background of the present political organization", which, though republican in name, operates almost wholly in the spirit of China's ancient habitude. Very little published thus far has been based upon Chinese material. With the exception of W. F. Mayer's well-known *Chinese Government* (1878) and Père Hoang's *Mélanges sur l'Administration* (1902) nothing was available until two Russian student-interpreters issued, upon the downfall of the Manchu dynasty, a synopsis of its factitious reorganization in 1908. Their work, of course, had hardly appeared before it was rendered useless by a revolution still virtually proceeding.

Twelve chapters of this book constitute a systematic description of the services of the imperial government under the Manchus in China, approximately the period between Cromwell and the World War. The account of its organization is quite adequate to the scope of the volume as well as to the requirement of the intelligent reader; the actual working of its machinery, we are told, is still the secret of inaccessible archives, many of them already destroyed. Oriental autocracies leave little in the way of documentary evidence behind them. One could wish from the author some acknowledgment of certain benefits that show the Manchu régime to have been not altogether a blight upon China. He exposes the calculating and consistent selfishness underlying their polity from the moment of completed conquest to its collapse. Loyalty to his own race and culture forbids him to credit the extraordinary achievement of a small semibarbarous horde that supplanted native rule over two hundred million Chinese, extended the empire to its strategic limits, and gave them on the whole the most satisfactory administration they had known for a thousand years. The historian who tries to be impartial realizes rather sadly that recorded history shows few examples of successful self-determination. Some obscure ingredients in race-fibre seem to be essential to success in political control, and these are not often evident in highly intellectual peoples. With all their faults the Tartars throughout Asia have proved their ability to enforce order—which is better political performance than self-government in jealous provincial units degenerating into anarchy. The administrative machinery adopted by the Manchus and set forth in this volume was purely Chinese; its description applies to all the dynasties since Shi Hwang-ti; its appropriation to the needs of Tartar overlords, though inspired by no high ideals, maintained China for the Chinese until to-day.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—35.

It would seem that the real moral of this story is the need of strong hands rather than profound brains to produce such enduring results as Confucius approved. Dr. Hsieh's introductory chapter on the theory of rulership in ancient China shows that the right of the sovereign under the "Heavenly mandate" means "the passive, silent consent of the people clothed in mystical form". It is, perhaps, the one distinctly original contribution of the Chinese to the science of government, but its implication, the justification of rebellion to bring about a new deal in dynastic rotation, has always been a matter too delicate for frank discussion among statesmen serving autocrats. The theory vindicates the lawfulness of an outraged people in suppressing the Mings, but the author cavils at the substitution in the crisis of a foreign for a native dynasty. As a good Confucianist, however, we ought to expect his disapproval of replacing the Tsing dynasty by a republic—as Kang Yu-wei contends; for Confucius finds no place in his system for any except government under an accredited holder of the divine decree, a despot of sublimated morality.

Such reflections upon a rather polemical feature of the author's book need not abate our appreciation of its usefulness as an orderly and documented account of governmental institutions which still command the attachment of the Chinese people at large. Perhaps the editor rather than the author should be blamed for numerous misprints, for capricious transliterations of Chinese proper names, and for the absence of a necessary index, all of which might be remedied if the Johns Hopkins Press has occasion to reissue this excellent work.

F. W. WILLIAMS.

#### BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*A Short History of the American People.* By ROBERT GRANVILLE CALDWELL, Ph.D., Professor of American History in the Rice Institute. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1925. Pp. x, 520. \$3.75.)

THIS work is to be completed in two volumes, the volume under review covering the period of colonial and national history to the election of Lincoln in 1860. So many "short" histories of the American people have been published that one picks up this new attempt with a peculiar mixture of weariness and curiosity. But a careful reading of Professor Caldwell's volume is well worth while. It is fairly evident at the start that the work was not meant to be a "college text", for it has few of the earmarks of the text. There are a number of very illuminating maps, and the index is complete. But the teacher would be at some loss to know just how to assign the material as text-book readings. It might better be said that here we have some collateral reading for the teacher himself, for the author apparently takes for granted that his reader already has considerable knowledge of his subject.

The work as a whole is thoughtful and stimulating, and is really more of an interpretation of American history than a mere recital of events. In this interpretation one finds many of the points of view that so often occur to the mature college teacher of history, but so seldom appear in print. The traditional topics are treated, but not always in the traditional way. For instance, the Lewis and Clark expedition is described in chapter I. as a part of the process of discovery, and merely mentioned in chapter XI. as an incident in connection with the territorial expansion during Jefferson's administration. One looks through the administration of Jackson for mention of the specie circular, but finds it fourteen pages later in connection with a discussion of the causes of the panic of 1837—where it logically belongs.

The problem of balance and proportion is always a serious one for the author of such a work as this, and indeed the proper solution is largely a matter of opinion and purpose. It seems to the reviewer however that the chief criticism may be made at this point; one finds about as much space devoted to the Texan Revolution as to all the bank and financial disturbances and contests of both of Jackson's administrations. The spectacular contest between president and congress in 1841, affecting so deeply political reorganization and the direction of attention to foreign affairs, is all passed over in a brief paragraph. Page after page is devoted to the military details of the Mexican War, and only a few lines to the negotiation and terms of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo—indeed the name of that treaty is not mentioned except in the index. In general, diplomatic affairs do not seem to have secured their proper share of recognition.

Unusual care appears to have been exercised in the accuracy of details, and the proof-reading of the volume has eliminated those mistakes that mar so many otherwise first-class works. A slip occurs on page 442 where it is said that the application of California to be admitted into the Union as a free state reached Congress in December of 1850 (instead of 1849). The statement of fact in regard to the Dred Scott case (page 481) is slightly incorrect, as is also the statement of terms of the treaty with Texas in 1844 (page 385). But the work as a whole is so free from such errors that one can write only praise for the author. His literary style is admirably dignified yet his story absorbs the attention of the reader. One wishes for the author as great success with his second volume.

F. F. STEPHENS.

*Die Stichting van New York in Juli, 1625.* Reconstructies en Nieuwe Gegevens ontleend aan de van Rappard Documenten. Door Dr. F. C. WIEDER. [Publication XXVI. of the Linschoten Society.] (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1925. Pp. 242. Illustrated. 15 guilders.)

IN this work by a Dutch scholar, for whom the reviewer has great respect, we have to deal with hypothesis in a mass of interesting materials.



The assertive title is likely to raise a polemic. Likewise in the introductory thesis on the founding of New York by the Dutch (pp. 3-16), and elsewhere on the "oldest parts" of New Amsterdam, the author's cock-sureness will raise the question which he himself suggests (p. 4): "How do you know that?"

The soundest section of the book (pp. 17-35) is devoted to a discussion of the primitive form of government in New Netherland. Wieder is right in declaring that "one of the most remarkable things about the Van Rappard Documents is that they reveal to us the birth of legislation, law, and administration in the Dutch colony". On pages 99-110 he discusses the source and value of these documents, and on pages 111-179 he reprints the Dutch texts from the Henry E. Huntington Library publication of 1924; but he has added numerous critical and explanatory notes. Singularly enough, his main as well as running headings to Documents D, E, and F carry misdatings. Of these F (pp. 161-179), the letter of Secretary de Rasière, September 23, 1626, is the most valuable, since it reports what he observed and what had been done, rather than, as in the other documents, carrying more or less tentative proposals of things to be done. On pages 181-226 Wieder reprints Dutch ordinances from 1580 to 1624 in vogue in Holland and Zeeland.

In this work Wieder has come to the conclusion that the so-called Van Rappard Documents show that Manhattan Island was settled by the Dutch West India Company in July, 1625; that at and before this date they reveal the presence of free traders who bore no obligation to the authority of the Company. The colonists of 1624, he says, were different from those who came over in the expedition of 1625, as the latter were workmen (*bouwlieden*) in the employ of the Company and the sole founders of what is now the city of New York. On the four ships with cattle, utensils, seeds, and other things, only workmen came—not a colonist, Wieder says. He assumes that the settlers of 1624 found on the main land (Albany) an existing fort, which they strengthened and called Fort Orange; but for this there is no evidence. Again, it has not been proven that a fort was built on Noten (Governor's) Island and that a settlement was started there in 1624. The presumption is a far cry from anything stated by the historian Wassenauer.

We come now to examine the main contention. The instructions to Crijn Fredericksz., an engineer who came over with the 1625 expedition, and to Willem Verhulst, the commander, furnish Dr. Wieder's leverage. Here and there he himself points out variations of execution with respect to the intention of the instructions. That does not matter to him. The engineer carried out the instructions (Doc. E), which Wieder sets about to reconstruct from plans he finds in two works on fortifications, by Henricus Hondius and Simon Stevin, both of 1624, and particularly from a plate of 1581 of the town Philippeville, built in 1555, in a work of Braun and Hogenburg, because that plate shows a huge five-point fort and seems to fill the bill. Then having set together Crijn Fredericksz.'s instructions



in the light of their specifications and the aforesaid plates, he lays down the location of the fort on Manhattan Island, particularly on the street plan of the Lyne-Bradford map of *circa* 1730. Contemporary writings are silent. The engineer's instructions do not mention Manhattan Island. None the less, Wieder makes the huge fort of five angles follow the lines of Pearl, Broad, Beaver, and Whitehall streets, with made ditches on Broad and Beaver. But Wieder judges that the *settlement* named Fort Amsterdam, which is only casually referred to by De Rasière, as existing on his arrival on July 28, 1626, is the great five-angle fort, with housing therein, suggested in the instructions, as though such a fort had been begun more than thirteen months before and was now built. And he bases this on the definite specifications of those instructions, that they could not be altered in the general plan except by authority of the Directors at Amsterdam. But the fact had been known before these documents were discovered that the original intention was to build a five-point fort of large dimensions, which was abandoned. Just here is the crux of the whole matter. Since Minuit was in New Netherland when the engineer arrived, and was a ranking member of the council as well as a "voluntair" in the colony, he was aware of every project. Minuit returned to Holland, while the engineer continued in New Netherland, and when Minuit came back in May, 1626, he came at the head of an expedition which fixed itself on Manhattan Island. Wassenaer and other evidences show that in 1626 a quadrangular fort was staked out by Crijn Fredericksz. From then and ever thereafter the fort on the point of Manhattan Island is a quadrangle. Wieder assumes (p. 48) that the engineer returned to Holland in September, 1626, because the projects of a large five-angled earthwork fort, buildings, etc., had been completed, or the fort had come down (pp. 55-56); whereas, it is more reasonable to assume that the major plan was modified, before work was begun, by consent of the Directors at Amsterdam, in conformity with representations that Minuit made to them, which were only carried out, and in the less pretentious manner, during Minuit's directorship, which operations vastly differed from the original instructions to Fredericksz. Neither his nor any other instructions of 1625 allocated them to Manhattan Island or any particular place. Only, a fort when built, and wherever built in a suitable place, was to be called Fort Amsterdam.

There are misprints on pages 12, 52 (note), 75, 94, 95, 138 (note), 140 (note), and 147.

VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS.

*Increase Mather, the Foremost American Puritan.* By KENNETH BALLARD MURDOCK, Ph.D. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1925. Pp. xv, 442. \$6.00.)

A NEW biography of so important a Puritan as Increase Mather by a teacher of English in Mather's own Harvard should make interesting reading, the more so when the mechanical execution of the book is unim-

peachable and the illustrations well chosen. The historian examines it critically to discover whether the writing is scholarly. In this case the author accompanies his narrative continually with a barrage of foot-notes, which fortify his conclusions even against recent critics of the Puritans. The book is well written and should take its place as the standard biography of the greatest of a trio of men who have made the "Age of the Mathers" an appropriate name for the period in which they lived.

In the main the volume is well proportioned. After an introductory chat about source-material the author reckons with heredity and environment. The chapter on Boyhood is an ingenious stretching of a few threads of fact to cover a bare period of the hero's life. Harvard College is glimpsed when it was a "little academy in the wilderness", and when two-thirds of its graduates entered the Puritan ministry. Increase Mather inherited the tendency.

The reader sails with the young minister overseas, appreciates his interest in the mother country, senses the rivalry between Anglican and Puritan, and shares in Mather's disappointment when he discovers that his future lies in America. At this time he is described as puritanical in his introspection, centring his thoughts on his struggle towards Heaven, craving a chance for self-forgetful service, and in the same breath complaining of a scanty wage for colonial preachers.

One can not help liking Mather as his biographer limns him—preacher, pamphleteer, adviser of government, colonial agent in England, president of his own college—always a man of learning, skill, and vigor. But the reluctance to find anything to criticize makes the reader a bit skeptical of the writer's judgment in every circumstance. It is pleasing to be assured that Mather was no bigot, as indeed he could not have been when he participated in the ordination of a Baptist minister in Boston; that he believed in inoculation for smallpox as well as in witches on broomsticks; and that he knew how to discriminate between temperance and prohibition, but the modern iconoclastic biographer would not so readily excuse his faults.

There are delightful paragraphs in the book, as when the father and his boy Samuel are described in hurried departure for London (pages 188, 189), or upon their return after several years of absence (page 286). Occasionally the style is marred by an involved sentence, as at the end of the long paragraph on page 21, but in the main the diction is clear, pleasing, and at times picturesque. Always the picture is painted against its proper background.

The main criticism of an ecclesiastical historian would be that too much space is given to the political activities of Mather at the expense of his ecclesiastical career. The meticulous care with which the residence in London is detailed would be justifiable in a history of the charter, but Mather was not primarily a politician or a diplomat, but a minister. As such the life of a pastor among his people, of a clergyman among his fellows, deserves a fuller treatment. Surely a sixty-years' ministry in

religion calls for a religious appreciation. One would like to know what he did on Sundays as well as week-days, how he married and buried folks and baptized their babies, and ministered to the various spiritual needs of a people whose fathers and mothers endured all the inconveniences of a new continent for the sake of religion. To write the biography of a Puritan divine and scamp his main business is like the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out.

Then too one would like to know more of the wife who shared his fortunes for half a century, and of the family and its home life. It seems a pity that these topics should have been almost overlooked to give room for the larger interests of the colony. These are faults of proportion, but they are serious when they create a false perspective. Yet altogether it is a book to welcome and appreciate.

HENRY K. ROWE.

*The American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century.* By HERBERT L. OSGOOD, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of History in Columbia University. Four volumes. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1924-1925. Pp. xxii, 552; xxiv, 554; xxviii, 580; xxiv, 582. \$20.00.)

IN passing from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century, Professor Osgood has faced a much more intricate and involved situation than that which confronted him in writing his earlier volumes. His field has steadily widened, his problems have become much more complex and difficult, and his material, no longer chiefly in printed form, has lain to a considerable extent in manuscript, scattered and remote. Though he still aims to explain the nature and growth of government in the American colonies, he has been called upon to consider for the first time many new and important questions. He has had to treat of the interminable controversies that took place between the governors and the assemblies, to describe the relations that arose among the expanding colonies themselves, and to take into full account the manifold external influences that were operating to temper these relations and to hasten or retard the progress of all the colonies toward co-operation and union. He has had to deal with a more aggressive British government, to note the changes that were taking place in the British colonial system, and to examine the policy according to which that system was administered. Also he has had to face the incidents and issues of four intercolonial wars, with their tortuous Indian entanglements, and to enter the field of Anglo-French rivalry, at least as far as the contest on land was concerned. He has found himself called upon to take up certain other and more specifically colonial subjects, such as ecclesiastical relations, immigration, and piracy, that have not appeared before, but he has been able to omit, except incidentally, all mention of the land system, the judiciary, finance, and the methods of defense that were given considerable space in the volumes on the seventeenth century.

A cursory examination of the work soon makes it clear that Professor Osgood has not attempted to expand his treatment *pari passu* with the expansion of his subject in order to write the history of the colonies as a whole and in their larger relations. He has made no effort to treat of other than the thirteen colonies which finally revolted and formed the United States of America, and has had no intention of bringing into view the British colonial system in its entirety or of discussing separately and in detail the British organs of control which were concerned with the colonies and their officials, as he would have done had he been interested in the subject as a phase of British expansion. He has taken his position, not in England but in the colonies, because he is convinced that such a viewpoint gives a truer knowledge of the real condition of the problem, and has moved about from colony to colony so as to bring out the individuality of each and to observe the situation from such different angles as to determine what each colony contributed to the general composite. This composite, however, he leaves the reader to work out for himself. Thus what he has written is not British history, nor yet American history in any narrow and exclusive sense of that term, but something between, more American than British and growing more and more American with every decade that passes.

The four volumes here presented cover the history of the thirteen colonies from about 1689 to the years 1760-1763. The author has met the difficult problem of arrangement with a full understanding of the perplexities involved and has solved it in a manner most satisfactory to himself. His chapters fall into three groups: those dealing with the English and the Continental situations, about one-eighth of the whole, counting by pages; those dealing with general topics relating to all the colonies, about one-third; and those that treat of the colonies individually, about one-half. The third group contains thirty-five out of the fifty-eight chapters making up the whole, and varies in their allotment, single chapters being given to Connecticut and Rhode Island, and as many as five to Massachusetts (including in part New Hampshire), five to Virginia, and eight to New York (including in part New Jersey). There is no grouping by sections, except in the case of New England, which Professor Osgood thinks the only true section in colonial times. There is no continuity of treatment, for, except with Connecticut and Rhode Island, the history of each colony is broken up into administrations and the parts are distributed so as to keep the narrative always at about the same chronological level. Thus the work partakes of the character of essays, each more or less complete in itself but bound together as parts of a common whole. Phases of constitutional growth and points of likeness and unlikeness are, therefore, difficult to discover, and even the tendencies toward union, upon which Professor Osgood lays a great deal of stress, are nowhere made apparent, but must be largely determined by the reader for himself. The volumes call for close attention and considerable preliminary preparation, and the incautious and unready reader is likely to lose

his way, if he is not careful, and to miss many wise comments and suggestive generalizations, simply because Professor Osgood has strewn them about almost casually through his pages.

In form of presentation, the work is neither narrative, description, nor interpretation, but a mingling of all three. Often the author enters upon a very detailed study of a situation—as of the lax financial administration under Cornbury—in order to demonstrate a particular point just as far as the evidence will allow. In many chapters he follows with seemingly unnecessary minuteness the history of colonial wars and Indian conferences, apparently very much interested in such matters and loath to miss any features that might throw light on questions of administration and finance. Sometimes he generalizes at length on broader themes, as in his comments on the attitude of British, French, and Spanish toward the Indian in the eighteenth century; the French and British systems of colonization; Quaker and Puritan; the Halfway Covenant and New England; and the general movement toward toleration. Again, he throws into a few lines a provocative idea that stimulates thought and might have been expanded into an essay, as when he speaks of learning in New England schools as “floating harmlessly about in a sea of dogmatism” and of the land riots of New Jersey as “an event in some respects as significant and important” as Bacon’s Rebellion in Virginia. Such citations could be multiplied by the score and they are well worth the price of discovery.

Though sympathetic, in the main, with the colonial point of view, Professor Osgood can hold the balance even when passing judgment on the governors and the assemblies. Fletcher, Cornbury, and Cosby were “greedy proconsuls” and Belcher was a “brutal partisan”; but of Bello-mont, Dudley, Nicholson, Spotswood, Gooch, Shirley, Sharpe, Eden, Ellis, and Wright, he says much in praise and little in blame. Of the colonists and their assemblies he can speak as sharply as he can of the Board of Trade and of the “busybody” Newcastle. He calls attention to the “anarchistic tendencies of American democracy” (IV. 27), the military inefficiency of the colonists generally (IV. 226), and their wretched ways of doing business. He writes of the “crude and arbitrary methods” of the assemblies, of their “aggravating agnosticism”, their “parsimonious legislation”, their “legislative absolutism” (several times), their “exaggerated sensitiveness concerning their liberties”, and he leaves the impression that in their quarrels over political and civil rights they neglected many colonial needs, social, educational, religious, agricultural, and defensive. He shows that “politics” wrought their evil work in colonial days as they have done since, and that the early guardians of our “liberties” juggled with charters, instructions, and acts of Parliament in a manner to be envied by a modern legislative obstructionist, and were always determined to assert their own “rights” at the expense of the king’s prerogative. With a weak governor, such as Shute, for example, “a bungler in politics”, they were ready “to follow a career of petty annoyance and encroachment” (III. 156) that does not arouse our respect,

however much we may sympathize with their cause. Governors often had only "empty protests" for an answer, and one can but wonder that men could be found in England to undertake (rarely with satisfaction to themselves, either mental or financial) the thankless task of representing the king in America.

There is nothing exciting, sensational, appealing, or dramatic about Professor Osgood's manner of presenting his subject, yet parts of what he has written are absorbingly interesting. The accounts of the Zenger trial and of the Great Awakening, "the first great and spontaneous movement in the history of the American people", reach a very high level of historical insight and understanding, couched in a style admirably adapted to the events narrated. Elsewhere also the work is full of color and the personal touch. It is mature, mellow, stimulating, and always instructive, delightful for the advanced student and strong meat for the beginner, full of shrewd remarks, careful judgments, and not infrequently blessed with satire and humor. It is true that at times it drops to lower levels and one may then apply to it the words of the author himself, used in another connection, to the effect that certain chapters are "regular and routine in their character and the events with which they [are] concerned do not particularly stir the imagination" (II. 159). At its best it is history of a rare excellence; at its worst a great reservoir of organized knowledge, material for history rather than the finished product itself, rising above the plane of the dry-as-dust pedestrian order because of the thoroughness with which the material is digested and the remarkable skill with which the intricate and scattered details are gathered together and wrought into a readable whole.

Professor Osgood asks and with reason that criticism of his work be directed to the measure of success which he has attained under the limitations that he has set for himself. But even so it is not without interest to ask the question whether so intensive a study of but a part of colonial history does not involve some inevitable shortcomings. In the first place, a treatment of the colonies to 1763, which omits all mention of British policy and control after the year 1730, omits all mention of the Molasses Act and its significations, and dismisses the whole British end of the story after 1714 in a chapter but a few pages longer than that devoted to the first intercolonial war—the effects of which, the author acknowledges, were but "slight and superficial" (I. 115)—is certainly wanting in an appreciation of real values on a large scale. To pay almost exclusive attention to politics, government, and administration and to pass by with only an occasional reference all consideration of economic and social forces, the significance of rising prices, debt, and the cost of living, the growth of regional and radical feeling, and the bearing of commerce and the increase of wealth on legislation is to run at times pretty near the surface and to miss some of the deeper currents of colonial life. That Professor Osgood has many of these things in mind is evident from his comments, and every once in a while he gives us brief disquisitions on



aspects of them, but they are not anywhere placed conspicuously before the reader. We do feel, it is true, the spirit of the time changing after 1740 and moving in the direction of independence, but one has to be a careful observer to read the signs. We do notice a cooling of religious enthusiasm, a lessening of ecclesiastical control, an increasing importance and freedom of the laity, a demand for non-sectarian education, a bolder secular attitude toward the militant denominationalism of the older colleges, and other features characteristic of a more liberal, more united, and more self-conscious people. But no special stress is laid on any of these things. Perhaps if Professor Osgood had been able to write the final essay that he planned, summing up conclusions from the four volumes, he would have dealt with them at length and in their proper relations.

In the second place, Professor Osgood's position of viewing all details of his subject from the standpoint of the colonies tends to create in him a disrelish—I would not call it a prejudice—for the British system and all who upheld it, and to make it difficult for him to understand just what was the British outlook before 1763. I do not think that he has fully grasped the meaning of the mercantilist policy, which for some reason or other he calls “a system of benevolent despotism” (II. 315), for he has not studied it in its evolution or gone deeply enough into its literature to distinguish all the gradations of mercantilist thought, some of which he ascribes quite too much to politics. I am not at all satisfied with his use of the word “imperial” (“imperialistic plans”, “imperialistic régime”, “imperialistic policy”) or his phrase “consolidated autocratic empire” (I. 144), used to characterize the ends sought by the Board of Trade. I think in all this he has imagined something that did not exist. He makes a distinction between a mercantilist and an imperialist, deeming the latter a Stuart product and therefore wholly bad; and he speaks of certain loyalist writings as emanating “from Stuart policy and ideas” (III. 268). This seems to me pure fancy. His own definition of “imperialism” (IV. 6), his remark that the policy of the age was “wholly guided by the principles of mercantilism” (I. 495), and his further statement that “it is easy to see how little prospect consistent Whiggism offered to colonial liberty” (II. 103) show that as far as the colonies were concerned there was neither “imperialism”, “loyalism”, nor “Whiggism” distinct from mercantilism, and that what he and others call “imperialism” before 1763 was simply applied mercantilism. For this reason his attitude toward all those who wished a closer union with the mother country (Gershom Bulkeley and the Connecticut “malcontents”, for example (III. 268) strikes me as distinctly unfair. I am frank to say that I have never been able to see why England should be so severely reprimanded for her policy of consolidation, for she had ample arguments in its favor, or why those in the colonies who favored it (and there were many mercantilists there, Professor Osgood to the contrary notwithstanding, I. 155) should be looked upon as wrong-headed. We have no right to assume that England

in pursuing her colonial policy and attempting to govern her own colonies across the sea was aware, or could have been aware, that she was violating "the fundamental principles of political liberty". Professor Osgood is inclined at times to make this assumption. When he speaks of "the irrepressible conflict between imperial policies and colonial rights", as the form the struggle took, one is prone to ask what, outside the chartered colonies, were "rights" in colonial days. Is there not here a reminiscence of the now discarded doctrine of the inherent rights of man? Furthermore, Professor Osgood repeats the old charge of "neglect", made familiar by Doyle, as if it were something characteristic of Britain's attitude toward the colonies. Had Professor Osgood studied British official habits as carefully as he has the proceedings of the colonial legislatures, he would have seen, I think, that the so-called "neglect" was in part good mercantilism and in part a representative eighteenth-century British dislike of business efficiency. As to the Nova Scotia instance, upon which he lays stress (III. 512), he should have remembered that Nova Scotia, like Newfoundland, was a fishery first and a colony afterward. Professor Osgood sees the British mind from America, and distance has lent disenchantment to the view.

There are a few not very serious errors, as when Professor Osgood speaks of a governor's instruction as issued under the privy seal (I. 34); of Connecticut as sending a copy of her law-book to the Privy Council (III. 272); and of the Cockpit as if it were at Westminster instead of at Whitehall (I. 303, 315; IV. 273), all of which shows a certain unfamiliarity—evidenced elsewhere throughout the volumes—with the technique and topography of British governmental administration. There are ten or a dozen inconsistencies in the use of words (such as "indented" and "indentured"), some forty or more typographical mistakes ("ben" for "been", "last" for "least", etc.), and a score or more of slips in the spelling of proper names ("Loudon" for "Loudoun", "Lyttleton" for "Lyttelton"). There are some slight and easily corrected inaccuracies in grammar ("like" for "as in"; "odds was") and occasional obscure references in the foot-notes (as "Cal, p. 683"), and there is something wrong with the last lines of the paragraph on page 447 of the fourth volume. But when one remembers that this work never had the benefit of the author's last revision, and that the manuscript as left offered the editor many troublesome problems in preparing the copy for the press, one can only wonder that the slips are not more numerous. I can not close this notice of a really great work, which within its limits is a veritable encyclopedia of accurate knowledge and commentary concerning eighteenth-century colonial history, without extending to Professor Fox my congratulations on the success with which he has performed his difficult editorial task.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*The Origins of Prohibition.* By JOHN ALLEN KROUT. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1925. Pp. 339. \$3.50.)

THIS is an objective study of the movement toward prohibition from colonial times, when legislatures intended primarily to insure adequate distribution of the "good creature", to the middle of the nineteenth century, when reformers secured the Maine law to forbid the manufacture and sale of intoxicants. The range and industry of the author's research are amply proven in his foot-notes and bibliography. His detachment is commendable to all who have opinions on the Eighteenth Amendment.

Even while colonial legislatures sought to regulate a useful commodity, they were also placing checks upon drunkards and upon sales to Indians, negroes, and apprentices. For liquor in such persons was an immediate menace to society. At the same time there were voices crying out against any use of strong drink. The Puritan statesman, John Winthrop, believed that drunkenness led directly to lawlessness. The divines, Increase and Cotton Mather, charged intemperance with abetting the attacks of liberal thought upon Calvinistic theology. Through the eighteenth century, Quaker, Methodist, and Baptist missionaries for the cause of evangelical religion joined their exhortations to the protest against liquor. Then appeared the first reformer who reached his convictions from scientific observation. Dr. Benjamin Rush studied the diseases of the camp during the Revolution. He declared that most of them were caused by the use of alcohol.

Stirred by such evidence the reformers went forth in the new century on a crusade to save society. They associated the demon rum with deism and democracy, those Jeffersonian menaces to Puritan America. Temperance had its greatest success among New Englanders, no matter where they settled (map, p. 130). As a part of rising national consciousness, the temperance movement spread rapidly after the War of 1812. Its leaders at first tried to keep it out of politics, but soon many became convinced that "moral suasion" could not permeate the mass of society rapidly or effectively enough. Despite the protests of those who would continue to apply "light and love" to benighted fellow-citizens, a militant minority would have done with licensing systems. Faith in the "perfectibility of man" was weakening. The zealots would bring the force of law to bear upon unregenerate men.

The first law, enacted by the legislature of Massachusetts in 1838, forbade the sale of liquors in quantities less than fifteen gallons. It was instantly recognized as undemocratic. In a political overturn, Democrats ousted Whigs and repealed the law. There was still work to be done before common men would accept such a check upon themselves. Most effective aid came from an unexpected source. Reformed drunkards toured the country to organize Washingtonian Societies. Hawkins and Gough, with keen appreciation of the dramatic and the sensational, stirred a responsive emotion in the average American. There was a

veritable inundation of speeches, pamphlets, campaign literature. And when the reformers tried again to write their desires into the laws of Maine, the reaction was not strong enough to force a repeal.

The author ends his account at this point in the history of prohibition. He has presented its first phase: the development from temperance to prohibition, advance from persuasion to legal coercion, restriction of personal liberty for the welfare of the group. There remains a consideration of the second phase: the spread of coercion through the statute books of the states into the law of the nation and, more provocative of reflection, the story of enforcement and its consequences in American society.

ARTHUR B. DARLING.

*The Diaries of George Washington, 1748-1799.* Edited by JOHN C. FITZPATRICK, A.M. Four volumes. Published for the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin Company. 1925. Pp. xviii, 455; 461; 458; 451. \$25.00.)

ON Sunday, the eleventh day of May, 1788, the man whom posterity was to call justly the Father of his Country, and who within the next twelve months was to take office as first President of the United States and carry to success the great experiment of the new constitution, sat "at home all day" carefully counting the number of "gentleman's pease", and of various other varieties of the same legume, which could be contained in one pint. Of the gentleman's pease 3114 were necessary. For the relief of the reader of the year 1926 let us hasten to say that this was in pursuit of the eminently practical agricultural task of computing the number of quarts of each kind of peas which would be required to plant a given plot of ground. On the ninth of September, 1781, after fighting the campaigns of the American Revolution through weary years of bitter hardship, barely supportable privations, and crushing discouragements, of what at many times seemed the leading of a forlorn hope, the General arrived at his old home on his way to the Yorktown peninsula and an epoch-making event. It was the first time he had looked upon this beloved scene, dearest to his heart of all things except the cause for which he was fighting, since he had left it in 1775 to take command of the Continental Army. In his diary he records only these words: "I reached my own Seat at Mount Vernon (distant 120 miles from the Hd. of Elk) where I staid till the 12th." What other man would have contented himself with those cold and matter-of-fact words, even in the most unemotional of diaries? It required nothing less than the birth of the United States Constitution to move Washington's pen to an intimation of feeling. On Monday the seventeenth of September, 1787, after the final adjournment of the Philadelphia Convention and the leave-taking of its immortal members, he was stirred to emotion, even in the diary. He

returned to his lodgings at Robert Morris's house, and "retired to meditate on the momentous w[or]k which had been executed, after not less than five, and for a large part of the time Six, and sometimes 7 hours sitting every day, [except] sundays and the ten days' adjournment to give a com'ee opportunity and time to arrange the business, for more than four months." Another side of the same great American is reflected on an occasion during this ten days' adjournment. On Friday the third of August, 1787, not being required that day to preside over the Convention, Washington records: "In company with Mr. Robt. Morris and his Lady, and Mr. Gouver. Morris I went up to Trenton on another fishing party."

Big and little significant facts like these throw floods of light on a great figure who is bound to remain at best obscure through the ages, and forever more or less of an enigma. For the historical writer and the professional student of Washington's life and times it is fortunate that this man kept a diary over some periods of his life, at least, if only for the purpose, as the author says, of recording "how, where, and with whom" his time was spent, but it is exasperating that he did not keep it in the time of his busiest activities, and that he did not put more in it. But we must be grateful for what the diaries do give. If we cannot know much of what he thought we can at least know how he spent his time. We can watch the daily life of a Virginia country gentleman at work and play. We can follow him in his very human amusements. We can get, rarely, very rarely, the cool glint of a carefully measured sense of humor. We can ride with the General on his almost daily fox-hunt at Mount Vernon. We can sit with him over a game of cards, where now and then an insignificant bit of money changed hands—Mr. Fitzpatrick, consulting Washington's expense accounts for the date, tells us just how much. We can even patronize with him the horse-races at Annapolis and help him smother his elation over having put a few shillings on the right animal, for the man of Mount Vernon had shrewd horse-sense. We can observe the phlegmatic calm of deliberation reflected on some state paper presented for his judgment as President, a paper which he took up to read, perhaps, after a "walk around the Battery". But it is the walk around the Battery which he records in his diary rather than the judgment which we so want to know about. For that we must turn elsewhere.

It is passing strange that not until almost one hundred and fifty years after the Declaration of Independence the diaries of George Washington should be published as a whole—so far as careful research can locate and bring them all together—and edited with proper scholarship. That this has now been accomplished is due to the enterprise of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union, and the painstaking and laborious work of that well-known and respected editor, Mr. John C. Fitzpatrick, of the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress. It is the fulfillment

of an historical service which obviously has too long required to be done.

Washington's diaries were by no means continuous nor consistently full. There is not much in them before the year 1761, except for brief entries in 1747 and 1751 on the journey over the mountains and the voyage to Barbados; also the journal written up hurriedly in one day from rough notes of the famous trip to the French commandant on the Ohio in the winter of 1753 and 1754; and a retranslation from the French of Washington's captured records of the march towards the Ohio in 1754. A few months at Mount Vernon in 1760 and 1761 are the next entries. But from 1763 to 1775 the diaries, with a few breaks here and there, are fairly continuous. Here they serve as a log of his plantation, of his daily doings, and of visitors to the estate. They preserve, as do that stately mansion and well-kept grounds to-day, a picture of country life at ease in Virginia, and of the serene tenor of the comfortable existence of a rich plantation owner, varied by trips on horseback across the state to collect rents and to satisfy an insatiable hunger for lands, for land hunting and land speculation were a passion with Washington all his life.

During the Revolution, Washington was too busy to keep diaries, though he made a determined effort to do so from May 1 to November 5, 1781, precisely the period of the Yorktown campaign. As might be expected, the diary for these months is a source of as commanding importance for military history as before 1775 it is for the student of Virginia agriculture in the eighteenth century.

After the war, from 1784 to 1789, the diaries again concern themselves with plantation routine. The fox-hunts are rarer, the daily visits to all the plantations more conscientious and regular, in an apparent effort to make the business of farming profitable. Entries on slaves are instructive. They destroy the old tradition that Washington never had a slave run away and that slave life on his farms was idyllic. "Women levelling the old ditch", "women grubbing in the swamp", "girl put to the plough", "the Women were spreading dung as yesterday", show that slavery was hard business even at Mount Vernon.

Aside from the Federal Convention, the one outstanding incident of these peaceful, close-farming five years was the trip to the Ohio country in 1784 to inspect his military land grants there, and valuable the record is in this instance to the student of the new settlements on the western waters and the question of maintaining ties between them and the eastern states, and of such a matter as the great sectional and political question of the navigation of the Mississippi.

For the period of Washington's presidency, years of his life not yet altogether appreciated by historians, the diaries are again meagre. From October 1, 1789, to March 19, 1790, when the President made tours of New England and Long Island; from June 2 to July 4, 1791, when he made his southern tour; and from September 30 to October 20, 1794, when he rode out against the Whiskey Insurrectionists, we have significant en-



tries; but usually during these years it required a journey somewhere to get him started on his diary. Most of this scanty material for Washington's presidency has already been published, but without Mr. Fitzpatrick's excellent notes. These entries contain much more than travel comments, much space as such occupy; many important and significant political facts are revealed, as explanations of diplomatic appointments, questions of foreign affairs, and Indian diplomacy and war (a factor which bulked large in Washington's solitudes). Items here are particularly helpful in checking up precise dates of political happenings, something so frequently necessary in historical criticism.

The student of the diaries on the whole must be disappointed, not in the excellent way in which they are edited nor in the attractive manner in which they are published, but in the fact that evidently they were kept by their writer for his own convenience and not for that of historically minded gentry of later generations. He knew what he thought, presumably, but did not expect to remember a lot of little facts and details of which he needed to keep record. The diaries are only a log and a memorandum. They reveal almost nothing of the inner workings of Washington's mind or of his emotional life. There is scarcely a subjective expression in them. We should not know from them that Washington ever read a book, though he does record that he went to many shows. But Mr. Fitzpatrick's notes in two places reveal sums spent for books.

The editing leaves little to be desired. The index seems adequate. The one or two insignificant slips noted by the reviewer will doubtless be caught up in one of the rapidly appearing reprints, for already the diaries have had a wide sale and have stirred up much talk by patriots with pious but historically misguided minds who object to humanizing a character who loses nothing of his greatness by standing forth now and then *en deshabillé*, as every great man must do in the privacy of a diary never intended for publication. The world owes a debt of gratitude to the Ladies of Mount Vernon, and scholars again to Mr. Fitzpatrick for this publication. It is certain that none of the future myriads of biographers of Washington can safely neglect the diaries now so conveniently assembled and printed.

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS.

*Jefferson and Hamilton: the Struggle for Democracy in America.*

By CLAUDE G. BOWERS. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1925. Pp. xix, 531. \$5.00.)

THOSE who complain that American history is not made interesting enough must be satisfied with this engrossing volume. What more dramatic chapter of our national history is available for the artist—and Mr. Bowers is an artist—than the days when Jefferson and Hamilton, each suspicious of the other's mortar, were laying the foundations of our

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—36.

nationality and of our political system? The author of the *Party Battles of the Jackson Period* has done even a better thing with the party battles of the Jefferson and Hamilton period. Here we have a dramatization in the form of historical narrative of the political struggle between these two giants of American party politics. The tired business man, even the tired college professor, can get entertainment as well as instruction in this unusually good book.

The printed literature of the period has been scrupulously studied and, in the opinion of the reviewer, accurately used. To say that this book contributes nothing new to our knowledge of the facts is not to say that it does not add greatly to our understanding of them, nor that there is not a place for it and a welcome for it among the general readers and among the professional students of American history. It is not an easy task to digest the appalling mass of material which has been published during the last one hundred years on the administrations of Washington and Adams and on the men and measures of that time; still more difficult is it to draw so appropriately and so deftly out of this mass the material for the background and the color, for the characters and the supernumeraries, for the facts and the psychology in the acts of the drama which, thanks to Mr. Bowers's nimble mind and skillful pen, unfolds so rapidly and so entrancingly. This study will give to a wider circle of readers a more intimate acquaintance with the period of the foundations of American nationality than anything since Parton's *Jefferson*.

The rapidity and nervousness of the style, sometimes moving ahead so breathlessly as to lose an antecedent or two, sometimes so eagerly close to the current vernacular as to be almost flippant (though never really so), deprives it of Parton's stateliness, but it vastly surpasses that great biographer in encyclopaedic knowledge and in historical accuracy. The chapters are enlivened with such "headlines" as "Jefferson Mobilizes", "Hamilton's Black Winter", "Hectic Days", "Comedy and Heroics". To the reviewer these touches, which are symptomatic of the paragraphs, possess merit. In an age when fiction writers have been jumping into the historical field and running off with some of the best prize plums it is good to see a sober student capture thousands of readers not only by the qualities of his style but by the dramatic interest of his narrative. To do this in 1925 one must have a feeling for the language of 1925.

The limitations of the book are that in the effort at artistry which the historical writer is making so successfully he occasionally crowds out of his pages some well-known but important facts that the reader—particularly the general reader for whom this book is written—ought to have before him. The chapter, used as a climax, called "Democracy Triumphant", is the weakest. Here the reader sees plenty of triumphant democracy but very little of the history of the election of 1800. The author depicts the scene as that of a great political revolution, yet he himself allows us to see if we look carefully that after all the whole issue

balanced on just how skillfully Aaron Burr could handle the Tammany and mechanic vote of lower New York City. If Aaron Burr had not lived in New York, and if the city itself, by a few hundred votes differently fixed, had voted for the Federalists in 1800, would there have been any "revolution of 1800"? There may have been a groundswell under way which could not be revealed in a period when several of the legislatures chose the presidential electors, but certainly there was no landslide for Jefferson in that election. This is true despite the opposition to the hateful Alien and Sedition Laws, and the "Reign of Terror" which Mr. Bowers so vividly describes.

As is too usual with statesmen and with historians who concern themselves primarily with domestic affairs, Mr. Bowers loses sight, I think, of some of the realities of international politics. While he portrays the economic and the selfish personal interests which lay behind the Federalists, he does not show that if these big business men, selfish as they undoubtedly were, had not stepped in and "put across" the movement for the Constitution no one else would have succeeded in rescuing the country from impending political anarchy and foreign encroachment. As he flays so meritoriously, in his analyses of Federalist pro-British policy, the supercilious contempt of the Federalists for the lot of the common man, he does not emphasize sufficiently—although I believe he himself realizes it well enough—the vital importance of imports from Great Britain not only to the fiscal system erected by Hamilton, not only to the newly established credit of the United States, but to the great experiment of the Constitution itself and of the new nationality which now rested on it, and in turn rested on credit, on commerce, on Anglo-American commerce, because more than nine-tenths of our imports came from England.

The "Portrait Gallery" in which Mr. Bowers gives us pen-pictures of the great and the near great is worthy of the *Mirrors of Washington*.

This book is the most readable and the most interesting which there is on the subject. The author must be a Democrat, one gathers, because he loves Jefferson and would never love, though he does respect, Hamilton. But almost everybody in the United States, including the writers of history, is Democrat or Republican, and the reader must see why this is so from Mr. Bowers's book itself. Any Jeffersonophil penchant which appears in these pages serves as a good antidote to the several recent studies extolling the marvels of Federalism and glorifying too exclusively the genius of Hamilton.

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS.

*The Correspondence of William Hickling Prescott, 1833-1847.*

Transcribed and edited by ROGER WOLCOTT. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1925. Pp. xxi, 691. \$7.50.)

DEPOSITED in the rooms of the Massachusetts Historical Society is a large collection of the papers of William H. Prescott, the historian.

They include a mass of letters from and to the historian as well as the noctograph manuscripts of his published works. From them have been selected and published in a handsome volume the most important letters covering the years 1833-1847. They begin with 1833 because there are few letters before that year. In fact, the volume contains only eight letters before 1837, the year in which *Ferdinand and Isabella* was published. The end is placed at 1847 because it was in that year that Prescott published the last book he completed. So far as the actual contents of the letters go, the volume does not run on all fours with the books Prescott completed; for it contains nothing on the writing and collecting of materials for his first book, and a great deal of it relates to collecting for *Philip II.*, his last book, left unfinished when he died in 1859. Mr. Wolcott, editor of the volume, is the grandson of the historian and the owner of the manuscripts from which the letters are selected. He has supplied his text with an ample number of foot-notes explanatory of persons and facts in the text, and he has placed in his introduction an adequate brief sketch of Prescott's literary career.

The appearance of Mr. Wolcott's volume is an important addition to our lamentably small number of books on American historiography. If it should be followed by a similar volume for the years 1847-1859 the result would be that, not forgetting Ticknor's valuable biography, Prescott would be the only one of our historians whose life has been adequately written. That the gap should have been filled is important because of the peculiar difficulty the ordinary student has when he tries to use the Prescott letters in their present form. They are frequently in difficult Spanish or French script which requires the aid of an expert for an accurate translation. Prescott's own letters were written on his noctograph, a frame with wires strung across and an inverted carbon sheet below them. The writer used a stylus, guiding his fingers by the wires, so that no strokes went below them, and often there was much irregularity due to lifting and replacing the hands between words. For these sheets expert interpretation is also necessary. It will be a service to historical scholarship and mere justice to Prescott if the editor completes what he has so well begun.

An outstanding fact in Mr. Wolcott's book is the extreme care of Prescott to find and use old manuscripts and other original sources. Other historians might be content to follow the texts of their predecessors, but Prescott was bent on building up his story on the basis of original authorities. He never heard of a promising collection that he did not have it searched, and his expenditures for copying were never stinted. Equally evident is interest in the narration of human action. The 250 pages he gave to Aztec Civilization in the first volume of the *Mexico* cost him two years of labor and many groans. He longed to be away with Cortés marching against the foe. The true difference between him and the later historian is not so much in method as in purpose. As

we come to see the last fifty years in perspective, it is likely that we shall conclude that the same may be said of most of the good historians of a century ago. The distinctive trait of the recent school of history is institutional history rather than the use of original sources.

The book also reveals to what an extent Prescott's work was aided by his friends. He had a strong power of making men wish to do something for him. Sympathy for his afflicted state was undoubtedly partly responsible, but his gentle and sincere spirit was the chief cause of this devotion. Blindness has been known to make men irritable; on Prescott it had no such effect. To the men who helped him his letters were filled with kindness and gentle persuasion. Among these men were diplomats, historians, scholars, and men of large business affairs, and they were equally marked in their eagerness to serve him, and all for friendship's sake. Of this class the most notable was Pascual de Gayangos, an eminent Spanish scholar and historian. Relations began between the two men when Prescott saw a review of his *Ferdinand and Isabella* by Gayangos in London. Immediately followed an offer by the Spaniard to look up manuscripts in London, and after that he visited Paris, Madrid, Simancas, and other places in Prescott's behalf. He read manuscripts, employed copyists, paid them for their services out of funds Prescott placed in bank for that purpose, made bargains none but a Spaniard could have made, and did a hundred other things. For it he would accept no payment, although part of the time he was nearly in want and at no time was he rich. The best that Prescott could do was to persuade him to accept a small loan when his funds failed him in London. Through Prescott he laid American historical literature under obligation while he showed the large soul of the true scholar.

JOHN SPENCER BASSETT.

*Blockade Running during the Civil War and the Effect of Land and Water Transportation on the Confederacy.* By FRANCIS B. C. BRADLEE. (Salem: Essex Institute. 1925. Pp. xii, 340. \$7.50.)

THIS well-printed volume is a very valuable contribution to the history of the Civil War. It is almost entirely of a documentary character, making available to the public a mass of interesting and detailed information, which the author has, on the whole, arranged and presented in excellent fashion. The fifty-three extremely interesting and important illustrations are mostly reproduced from originals in the author's private collection. Some of these are reproduced for the first time in this volume.

It is notable that the book is reprinted from the historical collections of the venerable and distinguished Essex Institute of Salem, Massachusetts, which, with its 115,000 volumes, 400,000 pamphlets, and numerous pictures and trophies, is a rich storehouse for the historian, especially in regard to maritime matters. Mr. Bradlee has succeeded in imparting his

information, much of it not intrinsically interesting, in graphic fashion, making justifiable the popular style he has chosen. While he has perhaps not produced a masterpiece of condensation such as the chapter on the Blockade-Runners in Soley's *Blockade-Runners and the Cruisers*, yet he tells the story of the long-drawn-out operation which eventually strangled the Confederation in much greater detail than the talented Soley, whose historical efforts received as little encouragement from Congress as do those of the Naval Historical Section to-day.

As Mr. Bradlee points out, following Soley and other historians, the value of the services rendered to the South by the blockade runners during the Civil War can hardly be overestimated. Since, at the beginning of hostilities, the navy of the South was practically non-existent, and communication with foreign countries vital, on account of inadequate manufacturing plants for the supplying of her troops with arms, ammunition, and other necessities, it is evident that the blockade runners alone prevented the United States navy for years from accomplishing the task which it finally did accomplish, namely, the defeat of the Confederacy. The author quotes a significant instance of the importance of a successful piercing of the Northern naval patrol, the case being that of the runner which landed at Wilmington, N. C., nine hundred barrels of gunpowder in time for its use at the battle of Shiloh.

It was inevitable that, especially at first, the officers in command of the blockade runners varied greatly in talent and in success, but their average efficiency improved, and they showed themselves men of pluck and resource. They were matched against men of much the same character, the blockade service of the United States navy being for the most part in charge of volunteer officers, all of them merchant captains and some with previous naval training. The blockade runner was a true gentleman of fortune, and he played for big stakes, a fact easily appreciated when it is recalled that, as Soley points out, so huge were the profits from a single success, that the foreign ship-owner shed no tears over the loss of a vessel on its third endeavor to run the blockade, if it had succeeded in running the gauntlet on its first two attempts.

As in other wars, both the North and the South underrated the military value of certain factors. The Northern leaders, no doubt aware of the tremendous advantage in their favor of naval power, started blockading operations in a half-hearted manner, with a "paper blockade", which it took the navy a long time to turn into a *de facto* one, as the resignation of most of its officers of Southern birth had resulted in disorganization, and the officers' corps itself was suffering from stagnation, all the flag-officers and most of the captains being over sixty years of age, and some of the lieutenants over fifty and not even yet of command rank. The inefficiency of the blockade was the subject of jest by the inhabitants of the Southern ports in the summer of 1861, and, while toward the last it was made very difficult for a runner to get through the cordon of



blockading vessels, yet the game, so remunerative if successful, went on without flagging until the close of the war.

Nearly one-half of this volume is taken up by a reprinted paper entitled the Railroads and the Confederacy, and three shorter chapters on the Confederate Post Office Department, the Southern Express Company, and the Telegraphs and the Confederacy, important themes not usually treated with proper respect in general histories. Mr. Bradlee reiterates the charge that the Confederacy did not adequately profit by its logistic advantages, particularly of its "interior lines" of communication, movements of troops and material from point to point within a defended district being much easier and quicker to make than by roundabout routes, which the enemy must resort to. He quotes the work of General E. P. Alexander (*Military Memoirs of a Confederate*) to prove that this strategic advantage was not properly exploited either in defense or offense, as suggested by the loss of Vicksburg and the invasion of Pennsylvania. The situation in the spring of 1863 was a most critical one, lending itself easily to academic discussion. Mr. Bradlee, like others before him, is of the opinion that, by a proper and a possible use of the railways available to the South, a concentration of Longstreet's, Johnston's, and Buckner's troops might have been effected in Tennessee, and that the thus augmented army, then under Bragg, might have defeated Rosecrans so decisively that Grant might easily have been forced to relinquish his bulldog hold on Vicksburg, and the loss to the Confederacy of 30,000 men and the freedom of the Mississippi avoided, especially if General Lee had consented to replace Bragg in command. In this case the great and crucial battle of the Civil War might have been fought in Tennessee instead of at Gettysburg. Just how much the quantity of political exigency had to do with the decision to invade the North will always be difficult to determine, but from the perspective of six decades it seems to have been founded neither on correct strategy nor on a sane estimate of the situation. Aside from the fact that the invasion of Pennsylvania required a line of communication nearly two hundred miles long, a very serious handicap in those days, even a victory would have only slightly prolonged the Confederate advantage, for not only was the city of Washington strongly garrisoned and fortified, but a defeat would have had the immediate effect of startling the whole North into concerted and vigorous action.

Our author lays considerable stress upon the alleged disinclination of General Lee to leave the Virginia seat of war, and especially to take command in the West, Professor Eckenrode's *Jefferson Davis* (1923) being quoted to indicate that Mr. Davis had perhaps a clearer conception of the importance of the Western field than Lee, the sombre state of whose mind is brought out strikingly in these pages. Many of his pessimistic utterances are recalled, such as his remark to Mosby, "I hope we have seen the last of secession", and his words soon after he had resigned his

commission in 1861, "I must say that I am one of those dull creatures that cannot see the good of secession". Even before that, in January, 1861, he wrote, "The framers of our Constitution would never have exhausted so much labor, wisdom, and forbearance in its formation, and surrounded it with so many safeguards and securities, if it was intended to be broken by every member of the confederacy at will. . . . It is idle to talk of secession". John S. Wise (*The End of an Era*) relates that Lee remarked after the fight at Sailors' Creek shortly before the final surrender, "A few more Sailors' Creeks and it will all be over—ended—just as I have expected it would end from the first". There can be no doubt that, like the great leader of the Union, Lee bore in his heart a cruel burden of sadness, borne only because of his devotion to what he believed to be his duty.

The 175 pages given to the railroads of the Confederacy cannot be neglected by one who cares to get a clear idea of the logistics of the Southern forces. The chapters on the Confederate telegraphs and the Southern Express Company are likewise both interesting and valuable.

EDWARD BRECK.

*The Life and Letters of James Abram Garfield.* By THEODORE CLARKE SMITH, Professor of American History in Williams College. Two volumes. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1925. Pp. ix, 1283. \$12.00.)

THIS notable biography was produced under unique conditions. In the first place the author was spared an enormous burden of drudgery, for he found the great mass of his material not only assembled but systematically arranged. From his seventeenth year until his death Garfield had kept a journal which, with a few disappointing gaps, chronicles the most important events in which he had a part. He himself put in order some material for his future biographer, and his venerable mother and devoted wife had added to that written record. At his death, "he left, carefully preserved, all his official papers; his letterbooks and letters; his manuscript journals, school and college memorabilia; the vast mass of letters received by him and a large collection of pamphlets and newspaper clippings bearing on his career. All this material, through the wise judgment of his wife, was systematically organized, classified, bound up in volumes, and indexed, a task which occupied the time of Joseph Stanley-Brown, formerly his secretary, for the space of about eighteen months" (Preface, p. vii). The papers were then placed in a memorial room built for them at the Garfield home in Mentor, and there they remained untouched for thirty years. In the early stages of his work, Professor Smith had the helpful co-operation of Mrs. Garfield, who survived till 1918.

Paying generous tribute to the manifold assistance thus afforded him, he says: "The function of the writer, in preparing such a biography, has

been strictly limited to selecting and arranging illustrative material, furnishing an outline of events and supplying explanations where needful. It is Garfield himself who contributes the personal and psychological analysis."

Throughout the book there is abundant evidence that this is "in no sense a family biography", but that the author has exercised an independent and discriminating judgment. Nevertheless, the reader often queries whether the fact that the great mass of material had been not only gathered together but assorted, indexed, and placed in cold storage for thirty years has not in some respects tended to preserve the perspective of forty years ago rather than to yield that of to-day. The historical student of to-day is surprised to find prominent in the text full tabulated returns of counties in Garfield's district for many successive Congressional elections of sixty and more years ago; the pages are weighed down by names of personal friends by the score, who are not "tied into the narrative", and by lists of barely-mentioned Congressional associates who have faded out of comprehensive histories of the period. The chapter, "Garfield, Rosecrans, and Dana", is an excellent piece of research, convincingly presented. But it seems the perspective of 1881 rather than of 1925 that devotes a thirtieth of this monumental biography to Rosecrans's shamefaced shiftiness and to Dana's nagging misstatements. Would not a single page of positive assertion, citing the Schuckers letter, Welles's *Diary*, and Dana's own despatches from the *Official Records*, have given to the present-day student ample guidance as to the influence of any Garfield letter upon the removal of Rosecrans from command? To devote to this issue a forty-page chapter, separated by five hundred pages from the narrative of the events with which it is concerned, seems to magnify its importance out of all due proportion.

Early chapters tell of the boy's upbringing by his capable mother upon the meagre farm; of his ambition for the life of a sailor, with its unromantic realization in a few weeks' service as bowsman upon a canal boat—the episode which campaign biographers deemed most deserving of emphasis for "popular consumption"; of his school days at the Eclectic; of his conversion and admission into the Church of the Disciples; of his association with "the brethren", and his zeal as an extemporaneous preacher which for years exercised a profound influence upon his mode of thought and of expression. Despite the widening of his horizon by the two years at Williams College under the inspiration of Mark Hopkins, he returned to Hiram to his intimate friendships in its circle of Disciples, and became principal of the Eclectic.

Within four days of the fall of Sumter Garfield tendered his services to the governor of Ohio, and soon began his military career as lieutenant-colonel of the 42d Ohio Infantry. He proved apt both to learn and to command. His longest service was as chief of staff with General Rosecrans. In his army service he was always for vigorous aggression. His journal and letters show his impatience with what he considered President

Lincoln's pitiable weakness (pp. 240-241), Halleck's inefficiency (pp. 220, 229-231), McClellan's unreadiness to attack (p. 237), and Rosecrans's slowness (pp. 310-311). Promoted to the rank of major-general of volunteers, and tendered the command of a corps by General Thomas, Garfield against his own personal preference decided to leave the army and take his seat in Congress in deference to the President's insistence that his service, by his voice and vote as a man "practically acquainted with the wants of the army" was more needed in the House than in the field.

In entering upon his new career, he set before himself a definite purpose: he would make himself an authority on finance, with the chairmanship of the Committee on Ways and Means as the goal. That goal he never attained, but his biographer presents, largely from Garfield's own journal and letters, a record of his diligent service as chairman of the committees on Military Affairs and Appropriations. On the floor of the House he developed great skill in debate. In those eighteen years of turmoil he was brought in close contact with so many men and issues that this careful biography, presenting Garfield's intimate judgments, teems with material which the student of the period will find indispensable. (Let it be added that every such student will marvel at the excellence and comprehensiveness of the 75-page index.)

Through seven chapters (chs. XI. to XVII.) attention is focussed so exclusively upon Garfield's legislative development that the reader gets few glimpses of his progress in other lines. With no previous intimation that Garfield had ever studied law, the reader is startled to find a man who had never tried a case in his life "participating as counsel in one of the most famous political lawsuits in the history of the Supreme Court", *Ex parte* Milligan (pp. 397 and 825-828). In the first half of the second volume the biographer breaks away from the chronological method and devotes some of the most valuable chapters to the study of Garfield as a public man, the open-minded thinker, the eager observer of progress in science, the stimulating framer of an educational programme which some colleges of to-day still find too "progressive". The charm of the man is best shown in the chapter on Friends and Family.

Three peculiarities in Garfield's fundamental make-up retarded his success and have lessened his fame. In an analysis so discerning that Garfield himself said: "His criticisms of my character are revelations of myself to myself", A. G. Riddle declared that "the one thing wanting in Garfield" was "egoism". "If, other things being nearly equal, a course is open to him which he can take without self-assertion, he will take it. So of that notable case of the salary bill" (p. 735). In a friendly letter of warning John Hay called attention to another trait: "'One thing thou lackest yet' and that is a slight ossification of the heart. I woefully fear you will try too hard to make everybody happy—an office which is outside of your constitutional powers" (p. 1071). Mrs. Garfield said that he was often deceived as to men's real characters (p. 928). He saw only the best side of men, and this often brought him into trouble, as in his associa-

tion with Oakes Ames, and with Parsons in the DeGolyer pavement case. Coupled with this "lack of worldly wisdom" in his judgment of other men was his assumption that they would look upon him with like charity and confidence. "When he found himself attacked or hated, he seemed to be almost as bewildered that such a thing could be possible as hurt by the revelation of unfairness" (p. 931). Again and again he showed an astonishing "lack of defensive pugnacity". When suspicion or slander were directed toward him, his impulse was ever to "stand silent in sensitive dignity, leaving his defence to his friends" (p. 530). Thus, had he sought a second hearing in the *Crédit Mobilier* investigation and there presented the statement which he later issued at the insistence of his friends, the chairman of the committee declared that its report "would not have reflected even inferentially upon Garfield" (p. 546).

That Garfield was not an aspirant for the presidency in 1880, and that his nomination involved no disloyalty on his part to John Sherman seem clearly proved by his journal and letters, and attested by both Sherman and Hoar, the chairman of the convention. The charge that Garfield's Cabinet was made up under Blaine's dictation is effectually disproved. The clash with the imperious Conkling was inevitable, for to have acceded to his demands, Senator Hoar declared, would have been "infamous". Material for the first time available in this biography indicates that Garfield entered the White House bound by "no trades, no shackles" (p. 1015), and that the "pledge", to which Conkling and Platt frequently referred but which they never produced, was nothing but an agreement to "consult" with the Stalwart leaders as to the patronage in New York, an agreement which they chose to interpret as a promise to make no New York appointment without their previous consent. An open declaration of war was seen in the Robertson appointment, of which Professor Smith says: "It was in the highest degree aggressive, almost ruthless, and it challenged opposition from all quarters, from Civil Service reformers as well as from spoilsmen. It violated at one blow as many different political conventions as it well could" (p. 1106).

Garfield was a man whose best work was of a nature little known to the public. Blaine declared that among his associates in public life Garfield, more than any other man, gave careful and systematic study to public questions, and he came to every discussion in which he took part with elaborate and complete preparation. He was a steady and indefatigable worker (p. 700). He developed great skill in persuasion. On the tariff issue he showed notable independence of the "Iron Men", and on the currency question "he spoke and voted, as he said, 'alone in the Mississippi Valley' against inflation". In the opening months of his administration it is Blaine's testimony that "from the very outset he exhibited administrative talent of a high order" (p. 1143). By his overthrow of Conkling he not only rid himself of that boss's dictation but served notice that the President was not "the registering clerk of the Senate". It was at his personal initiative that the investigation of the

Star Route frauds was begun, and when he was warned that disclosures might involve men high in office his reply was: "Go ahead regardless of where or whom you may hit. I direct you not only to probe this ulcer to the bottom, but to cut it out." He took an active part in effecting the plan for the refunding of \$250,000,000 of bonds. "It is certain that at the first session of the incoming Congress Garfield would have undertaken to press, with all the vigor at his command, the enactment of a genuine Civil Service Law" (p. 1154). He sympathized with Blaine's positive, aggressive policy as to the Caribbean, the Central American Isthmus, and the Latin American states, and with Blaine had determined to invite all of the independent governments of North and South America to meet in a Peace Conference at Washington, March 15, 1882.

Such was the career which the assassin's bullet cut short. The victim's patience and fortitude in his months of suffering endeared him to the whole nation. On the day before his death, he asked Colonel Rockwell: "Old Boy, do you think my name will have a place in history?" "Yes", replied his friend, "a grand place, but a grander one in human hearts." This definitive biography presents the most painstaking and discriminating study of the grounds for a just appraisal of Garfield's place both in history and in human hearts.

*The Recent Foreign Policy of the United States: Problems in American Co-operation with Other Powers.* By GEORGE H. BLAKESLEE, Professor of History and International Relations in Clark University. (New York and Cincinnati: Abingdon Press. 1925. Pp. 368. \$2.00.)

THESE addresses were delivered at Wesleyan University, on the George Slocum Bennett Foundation, in March, 1924; but they have been revised and expanded so that they now include the entire period during which Secretary Hughes has directed the foreign affairs of the United States. The volume is not a survey of American foreign policy from its beginning; the field is limited to the last few years, but with enough background to make the issues of this period intelligible. Neither is it a detailed history; many diplomatic controversies are not mentioned. The aim of the work is to present, to compare, and to discuss the recent distinctive foreign policies of the United States, particularly as these policies affect the problem of co-operation with other countries.

This volume admirably accomplishes the aim indicated by the author in the Foreword above cited. It is by all odds the most accurate and dispassionate review of the recent foreign policy of the United States yet published. There is a generous appreciation of diverse interpretations of the conduct of American foreign relations, though the author does not fail to add the weight of his own opinion in drawing conclusions from the array of facts. He avoids successfully the pitfalls of special pleading for propaganda purposes which so often entrap the incautious reader in many books on international relations. One wonders, however, why Professor



Blakeslee gives currency to the phrase "outlawry of war" which has been characterized by a keen critic as an offense against the English language. He would seem to reveal an emotional reaction on the subject of war, when he says that "war is the world's greatest problem", and also when he quotes with apparent approval the resolution of the Baptist Convention of June, 1924: "It is the most colossal and ruinous social sin that afflicts humanity today." The question would rather seem to be whether the greatest world problem is not the problem of international justice, and the most colossal sin, the sin of international injustice.

The main headings of this volume are as follows: I., American Policy toward Europe; II., the Monroe Doctrine and Related Policies; III., Pan-Americanism: Washington and Geneva; IV., Co-operation in the Far East: the Open Door and the Washington Conference; V., Japanese Immigration: Statutory Exclusion and American Policy; VI., Co-operation in the Future: Regional and World Policies.

Each of these topics is treated with fine judicious scholarship. The facts are carefully stated and various authorities are discreetly quoted. This is notably well done in the discussion of the Monroe Doctrine and Pan-Americanism. Professor Blakeslee's qualifications as an expert attached to the Washington Conference are quite apparent in his lucid, well-balanced exposition of the problems of the Pacific and of the Far East.

Although this volume consists of popular addresses, it is not open to criticism for the carelessness of statement or unsafe generalizations that unfortunately characterize so much of contemporary writing in the field of international relations. It is admirably adapted for use in college courses in that field. It should be carefully read by all earnest students of history and politics. That mysterious person, "the man on the street", will find it of immense help in forming an intelligent judgment concerning the international responsibilities of the United States.

PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN.

*The Senate and the League of Nations.* By HENRY CABOT LODGE.  
(New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1925. Pp. 424. \$4.00.)

THIS posthumous volume, sacrificing detail to an injudicious account of its subject, bears evidence of haste. Only the two concluding chapters (IX. and X., pp. 146-226) are chiefly concerned with reflections on the League of Nations and the Senate. So far as the facts relating to these two topics are set forth, there is little information in the chapters not heretofore well known and understood. Incidentally they illustrate clearly—as does much of the entire narrative—the bitterness which Senator Lodge came to feel toward President Wilson from near the beginning of the latter's administration. Yet the writer seems to take especial satisfaction in asserting over and over again that he never had any personal

hostility to the President. As early as August, 1914, declares Mr. Lodge, Woodrow Wilson laid plans which even then were designed to afford him "the great rôle of peace-maker for the entire world" (p. 28). This is to credit Mr. Wilson with superhuman foresight and, could it be proven to be a sound judgment, would certainly mark Wilson as a human wonder. The book leaves the general impression of being an angry diatribe chiefly directed against Wilson. It is the bequest of a sick man to the world, written (it would seem) under the delusion that somehow his story might alter the final verdict of history.

The book is not without interest. Its interest, however, is psychological and personal rather than historical. For the future biographer of Mr. Lodge it should have great significance. To any one desirous of estimating the Massachusetts senator as a powerful and influential figure in the Senate more especially during such critical years as 1919 and 1920, it will prove not merely enlightening but essential to the theme. Like Wilson, Lodge was obstinate. Like Wilson, he was often inconsistent in thought and speech. He has admitted guardedly his own rather obvious inconsistencies; but he has taken genuine delight in hammering home at greater length what he conceives to have been the far more fatal inconsistencies of the President (pp. 129-145). In the autumn of 1919, when, to his own discomfiture, Mr. Lodge discovered that the Senate would not consider amending the Versailles Treaty, he modified his hostility to that document and became an avowed reservationist—influenced, unless I have been misinformed, largely by the more liberal and practical attitude of his friend Senator Frank B. Kellogg of Minnesota, now Secretary of State in President Coolidge's Cabinet. Thenceforth Lodge's attitude gave ground for the belief that under certain conditions he would be willing to see the Treaty pass. Indeed he claims (pp. 214 ff.) that but for Wilson's obstinacy the Treaty, brought forward a second time, would have passed the Senate in March, 1920. For the resulting defeat, however, Mr. Lodge lived to have no regrets; he reasoned himself later into the firm conviction that the League could do nothing to stop wars; and as late as October, 1924 (judging by a foot-note, p. 211)—the senator died on the following November 9—he felt that it had effected "nothing of vital consequence to the cause of world peace".

Chapter IV. entitled, *The Lusitania* (pp. 32-65), should not escape the careful reading of the student of diplomatic history, although it has really nothing to do, except indirectly, with the theme of the book. It purports to set forth a well-worn story of the circumstances surrounding the formulation and transmission to Germany of the first *Lusitania* Note of May 13, 1915—the so-called "strict accountability" note. It ascribes to Wilson an unsuccessful attempt to get to Germany an intimation that the language of that note was to be taken by the German Foreign Office neither literally nor seriously. The chapter affords Senator Lodge a fine chance to cast slurs upon President Wilson and to reflect freely upon the President's alleged weakness at a very critical time. In substance

it is an attempt, based largely upon gossip, to prove Mr. Wilson a liar. Much of the story was given an airing for campaign purposes by Lodge late in October, 1916; and it has since then appeared under slightly different guises, notably in such sketches of Mr. Wilson as were printed by Mr. David Lawrence (1924) and by Mr. Robert Edwards Annin (1924). The complete truth about the matter can not yet be known. But there is enough additional evidence in a very recent book, *The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan* (1925), pages 378-382, 398-403, 421, to relieve Wilson of the charge of intentional deception. The entire story of the *Lusitania* Notes can hardly be clearly stated until much more nearly complete evidence—both official and unofficial—than has yet appeared is forthcoming.

Aside from occasional scraps of information, of slight consequence, from Mr. Lodge's diary (*cf.* pp. 13-15, 19-22, 65, 69, 79-83, 100), there is a great deal of matter introduced into the volume which has been long accessible elsewhere. Attention may be called in this connection to the so-called Fourteen-points address of President Wilson to Congress on January 8, 1918 (reprinted in full, pp. 84-92); and to the five appendixes which include President Wilson's address to the Senate, of January 22, 1917, on a League to Enforce Peace (pp. 262-269), three speeches by Mr. Lodge—his reply of February 28, 1917, to Wilson (pp. 270-296), his speech of February 28, 1919, urging a treaty of peace first and a consideration of a possible covenant and a league of nations later (pp. 227-261), and his speech of August 12, 1919, on the Versailles Treaty (pp. 380-410)—and finally, the stenographic report of the famous White House conference of August 19, 1919, between Mr. Wilson and sixteen out of the seventeen members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations (pp. 297-379). Cross-references in the course of the narrative bring all of this official material into direct relation to Mr. Lodge's thought and so perhaps justify its reappearance in the book. But had the narrative been skillfully and less hastily done, it is probable that much of this reprinting could have been avoided.

If this volume had confined itself to an outline in defense of Senator Lodge's positions in the Senate fight, and had the author excluded numerous references to President Wilson's personal views, it would have seemed justifiable. As it stands, the book reveals a man intolerant of differences of opinion, arrogant to a degree, and essentially petty in his point of view.

HENRY BARRETT LEARNED.

## MINOR NOTICES

*Ploetz' Manual of Universal History.* Translated and enlarged by William H. Tillinghast; revised under the editorship of Harry Elmer Barnes, Ph.D., with the collaboration of A. H. Imlah, T. P. Peardon, and J. H. Wuorinen. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1925, pp. xviii,

766, lxxxix, \$4.00.) This *Manual*, which for over forty years has been a standard reference book for students of history, has, under the direction of Professor Barnes, been thoroughly revised and its value further enhanced. It now comprises 766 pages of text as against 599 of the edition of 1905. Nor does this revision consist merely in the addition of new matter since 1903, but shows itself as well in the rewriting and rearrangement of much of the earlier chapters. The sections devoted to the Eastern Peoples have all been revised in the light of recent work and the latest views on chronology. In this division of the book, also, the title concerning the Lydians and Phrygians has been enlarged to embrace the Hittites and Aramaeans, there has been added a section on the Cretans and Mycenaean, and much material now obsolete has been discarded.

In the division treating of the early Western Peoples the following principal changes are noted: the story of the Celts has been rewritten as to civilization and the beginnings of Britain, and the account of Ireland reduced by the omission of much of its legendary history; the early history of the Greeks has been revised, and the mythical genealogy and non-historic traditions of the race have been eliminated; the ethnological description of Italy shows revision; the treatment of the Teutons has been slightly abbreviated in the geographical description of Scandinavia, and the ethnological section rewritten; and there are slight changes in the section devoted to the Slavs and Lithuanians, this division ending on the same page in the earlier and newer editions.

There are slight and unimportant departures, also, in the treatment of the fourth period of Modern History (1815-1883). What had been the appendix in the earlier edition has been made an integral part of the text and in its revised form, as the Fifth Period, brings the story down to the World War. In this section the "new history", which up to this point is not much in evidence, emerges in a chapter on Science and Inventions. Other new chapters concern the Self-Governing Dominions of Great Britain, the British in India, the Partition of Africa, Japan, Siberia, Siam, Afghanistan, Persia, and Arabia. The story of the United States for this period, covering less than nine pages in the former edition, has been expanded to twenty-four pages, ending with the inauguration of the Coolidge administration. Following this is new material on our Colonial Dependencies and Possessions (7 pp.), Latin America (18 pp.), an excellent and detailed account of the World War (38 pp.), and an equally valuable account of Europe since 1918 (20 pp.). There is an index of 89 pages.

This epitome of world history in its old dress has worn well. The accuracy of the additions can only be tested with use, but a necessarily hurried examination convinces that few inaccuracies are likely to be found. This conviction is strengthened by the imposing list of specialists named in the preface who read in manuscript or proof the revised material. Perhaps in those sections in which no revision was made the old

plates were used, forgetful of the fact that the cross-references thereon should have been changed to meet the new pagination of the revised parts. This may account for most of the erroneous references to be found on pages 48, 63, 75, 78, 152, 153, 164, 172, 177, 211, 535, and 562.

L. F. S.

*Ueber Historische Periodisierungen, mit einer Beigabe: Wesen und Ausbreitung der Romantik.* Von Georg von Below. [Einzelschriften zur Politik und Geschichte, XI.] (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1925, pp. 108, 2 M.) The aim of historical periodization is defined by the author of this scholarly monograph as the attainment of "a comprehensive judgment concerning a considerable section of time, its forces, their achievements and an estimate of their value". He thinks that one may observe in the periodization of history the real progress which the science is making. To the common objection that history is a continuous process which knows no periods, he replies that there are plenty of distinguishing characteristics which set off one section from another, that history presents not simply a plain, but mountains and valleys and border lands which the historian must search out and delineate. A more serious objection is found in the denial of the possibility of a general treatment of a particular section in the life of a people or group of peoples, that there is in such a period no real, inner unity, which binds together the various phases of civilization, political, economic, aesthetic, etc. This view is discussed at some length and rejected as utterly untenable. There follow some comments on the theories of Lamprecht, Spengler, Ottokar Lorenz, and others, which are found unsatisfactory. To these the author prefers the conventional division into ancient, medieval, and modern times. His conservatism is indicated also in his preference for political history as the chief basis for periodization. He admits that in any division which may be adopted there is a subjective element, but points out that this is true of all historical judgments.

In the second part the author applies his principles in the attempt to discover the dominant characteristics of the medieval period, which he finds in ecclesiastical unity and the independence of local authorities. The transition marking the close of the period he fixes at the beginning of the sixteenth century. There is appended a brief discussion of romanticism, which stresses the profound significance of the movement, not simply for literature, but for the entire intellectual life of the time.

While the subjects treated are highly controversial, the positions taken are ably defended and the tone is temperate and sane.

H. P. GALLINGER.

*Heretics, Saints, and Martyrs.* By Frederic Palmer. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1925, pp. vi, 256, \$2.50.) Dr. Palmer's book has seven interesting essays on the Anabaptists, Joachim of Floris,

Angelus Silesius, Isaac Watts, the martyr Perpetua, Mani, and Synoptic, Johannine, and Pauline Conceptions of Jesus. The publishers draw attention to them as illustrating an advance in the study of church history. Dr. Palmer's preface shows rather that they are intended to serve theological insight as the modern case system serves the teaching of law. This is the subordination of the historical to another interest. So, for example, the interesting account of Angelus Silesius, which cites and translates texts from the *Cherubinischer Wandersmann*, becomes an elucidation of mysticism with reflections on the reality and limitations of the mystic experience. The paradoxes of the poet are made incidentally somewhat intelligible by applying to them the identification of opposites as taught by Hegel's logic. Mani and Dualism is almost entirely a doctrinal discussion showing how Hegelian logic facilitates the union of divine transcendence and divine immanence. The first essay, however, on the Anabaptists and their Relation to Civil and Religious Liberty, is more distinctly an historical statement. As such it contributes nothing new, though the correlation of the Continental movement with the genesis of English Separatists and Baptists may help some learners to connected knowledge. Considered as an historical account it gives undue prominence to the behavior of minor circles deranged by fearful persecution and it leaves unmentioned the sane and eminent Hübmaier. Such an omission will not advance church history. The Münster episode also looms too large, though commendably it is described with temperate judgments.

One may fear that this case method has its dangers. The history may tend to lose its specific rights and suffer somewhat as did the Biblical proof-texts in the older dogmatics. One regrets that the account here given of Joachim of Floris is rather trimmed down to an introduction to the consideration of a modern theological attitude. It suffers by comparison with the charming chapter in Gebhardt's *Mystics and Heretics in Italy* or the account in Rufus Jones's *Studies in Mystical Religion*. In this essay Dr. Palmer leans to the improbable opinion that Amalrich of Bena was dependent on Joachim and he gives a wholly dubious statement of the views of Amalrich, attributing to him among other things the notions which Albertus Magnus ascribes to David of Dinant. How questionable this page is may be seen by consultation of the old but admirable critical contribution by Körnlein in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* for 1847.

F. A. CHRISTIE.

*La Vie en France au Moyen Age, de la Fin du XII<sup>e</sup> au Milieu du XIV<sup>e</sup> Siècle d'après des Moralistes du Temps.* Par Ch. V. Langlois. (Paris, Hachette, 1925, pp. xxviii, 387, 30 fr.) This is a new edition, with altered title, of the author's *Vie en France au Moyen Age d'après quelques Moralistes du Temps*, which first appeared in 1908. It is designed to stand as a second volume with his *Vie en France au Moyen Age, de la Fin du XII<sup>e</sup> au Milieu du XIV<sup>e</sup> Siècle, d'après des Romans Mon-*



*dains du Temps*, which was published in a revised edition, with altered title, in 1924. As in the case of the last-named work (see *ante*, XXX. 633), there has been extensive revision and enlargement. One title (*Fauvel*) has been omitted, and three titles (*Le Proverbe au Vilain*, *La Riote du Monde*, and *L'Épicier de Troyes*) have been added, and there is also an appendix on the new discoveries concerning Gautier le Leu and his works. The appearance of the volume has also been much improved and its value enhanced by the insertion of twenty full-page illustrations, for the most part drawn from manuscripts of the works studied, or from other manuscripts of the period.

The method of treatment remains the same as it was in the first edition. The author makes no attempt to present a systematic or complete view of medieval life, but simply lets the medieval moralists, whose works he has selected, speak for themselves. In the case of each work studied he sets forth concisely all the bibliographical and critical data which are required for its intelligent use; and then he summarizes its contents, giving extensive excerpts from the original text. Thus the reader is placed in a position conveniently to gather a mass of detailed information concerning medieval life without the labor of working through long and jejune texts. Difficulties of vocabulary make the volume often difficult reading for those who are not specialists; and it should be observed that the writings of moralists are likely to be dangerous guides for the unwary in search of historical truth. But M. Langlois has done his work with characteristic conservatism, and has posted abundant warnings to save the reader from pitfalls.

C. W. DAVID.

*Ioannis Seldeni ad Fletam Dissertatio*. Reprinted from the edition of 1647 with Parallel Translation, Introduction, and Notes by David Ogg, Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. (Cambridge, University Press, 1925, pp. lxvi, 204, 20 s.) Though the late thirteenth-century treatise known as *Fleta* had come down to Selden's time only in the unique manuscript then in his possession, it may well be doubted whether the printing of it in 1647, as far as the text itself was concerned, was an event of any great importance in the field of either literature or law. Largely an abridgment of Bracton, it contained, even in what it had incorporated from other sources, little that was new or original. Yet had it not been for the publication of *Fleta* at this time, there would not have appeared that remarkable essay which is still rightly considered one of the great classics in English legal literature. It was at the request of the publishers, and seemingly at least partly with the intent to make more presentable what he regarded as anything but a creditable piece of work on their part, a work in which he was careful to disclaim having had any share, that Selden wrote the *Dissertatio*.

The selection of this particular bit of writing to represent Selden in the *Cambridge Studies in English Legal History* is to be commended.

For the first time we have the original Latin text in such shape as leaves nothing more to be desired in the work of either editor or printer. Moreover, not only does the *Dissertatio* show Selden's depth of legal and historical knowledge to its best advantage, but the principal theme of the essay, the influence of Roman law upon the law of England, is a subject in which at present an increasing interest is being shown by legal historians both in England and elsewhere.

The *Dissertatio* is at once broad in scope and minute in detail; it is the type of writing which does not lend itself easily to an introduction. Mr. Ogg has succeeded in writing an introduction which is very readable and which teems with historical facts gathered from sources as far apart as manuscript in the Bodleian and legal periodicals. Notes to the English translation show an equally broad range of reading and research. The translation itself is very free, so free in places as to amount to a paraphrase of the original rather than a translation. However, the editor is doubtless correct in believing that those readers who depend upon the English translation alone would find a literal rendering of Selden's diffuse Latin style anything but clear.

One of the mysteries in English legal literature has been the *Summa* of Gilbert de Thornton mentioned by Selden in the *Dissertatio*. It is therefore not out of place to note here that the questions raised by Mr. Ogg as to the identity of the *Summa* can now be answered. Since his introduction was written there has been acquired by the Library of the Harvard Law School a fourteenth-century manuscript which, itself expressly labelled a Thornton, proves by comparison that the Hale manuscript in Lincoln's Inn Library is also a copy of the same work.

G. E. W.

*The Cambridge Modern History Atlas*. Second edition. (London, Cambridge University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1924, pp. 229 and 141 maps, 40 s.) This second edition of the *Cambridge Modern History Atlas* differs from the first only in the inclusion of certain revisions and corrections of the introductory text, and the addition of a seven-page "Subject Index to the List of Maps" prepared by the assistant editor, Mr. E. A. Benians, fellow and lecturer of St. John's College. "No new maps are included", we are told, "and the scope of the existing maps has not been extended to illustrate events that have happened since 1910." This being the case the volume would call for little comment were it not for the fact that through some accident the first edition was not reviewed in this journal.

Like the other volumes of the *Cambridge Modern History*, the atlas bears the names as editors of Sir A. W. Ward, Sir G. W. Prothero, and Sir Stanley Leathes, and is in the same format. Its maps follow the order of the narrative in the history, and an endeavor has been made to insert all the place-names that occur in the latter. The purpose of the maps is chiefly "to illustrate political divisions, other territorial changes, wars

by land or sea, the growth of particular States, the course of religious changes, and the history of colonial expansion". Economic maps are conspicuous by their absence, and the maps dealing with American history are inadequate. No map illustrates the American colonial land-claims, nor their cession by the states to the federal government; nor are there maps to show the explorations of the interior by De Soto, Coronado, Lewis and Clark, etc. Aside from these defects of omission, and bearing in mind the special emphasis on wars and the results of diplomatic negotiations, the content of the maps is eminently satisfactory and characteristic of the painstaking scholarship which entered into the making of the history as a whole.

A special word of commendation must be said in regard to the introduction of 142 pages, which traces minutely the territorial changes of the period covered. There is a separate index to this, in addition to the place-index to the maps, the latter by approximate latitude and longitude.

The mechanical execution of the maps is by photolithography, done by Stanford's. The effect is far less satisfactory than the copperplate maps of the Continent. The binding of the double-page maps without inserted stubs also makes difficult at times the inspection of the centre portions. On the whole, while the atlas is a decidedly useful accompaniment to the *Cambridge Modern History*, as an independent work of reference it is far less useful than Shepherd's *Historical Atlas*, to say nothing of the more detailed works of Spruner, Schrader, or Vidal de La Blache.

S. B. H.

*The Making of the English Constitution, 449-1485.* By Albert Beebe White, Professor of History in the University of Minnesota. Second edition, completely revised. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1925, pp. xxxiii, 461, \$3.50.) There is a certain presumption in favor of a book which has been found by its publisher to be worthy of a second edition, and which the author has long held under review and correction. Given a writer of Professor White's scholarship and powers of presentation, together with the collaboration of students and colleagues, the result is a text of high merit and distinction.

With considerable revision in detail, the general plan and purpose of the work remain the same as was set forth in this *Review* on the appearance of the first edition (XIV. 395). In spite of adverse criticism in point of balance and apportionment of material, Professor White maintains his belief that in the formation of the system of public law called the English Constitution, less is due to Anglo-Saxon institutions than to Norman and other Continental influences. This was the view of Maitland and Adams, and it has been strengthened by the researches of Professor Haskins. Again, in a classification which includes (1) the Law Courts, (2) the Executive, (3) Parliament, for similar reasons a marked preference is shown for the judiciary. The sharp topical arrangement

makes for clearness of outline, but some will feel the artificiality of treating the Chancery as a court of equity before its appearance as a secretariat, and of dissociating the King in Council from the beginnings of Parliament and the nascent House of Lords. The chief enlargement of material will be found in the direction of administrative departments, such as the Chancery, the Chamber, and the Wardrobe, which have been made accessible by the studies of Professor Tout. Changes of apparatus in the way of a descriptive bibliography in preference to topical readings, as well as a more diversified style of foot-notes, will be generally commended.

As in all works of so wide a scope, a margin of error must be allowed for, which in the present case is by no means large. There is the misleading statement of a land tax as continuing after the Danegeld (p. 119), while the sheriff's farm is represented as pertaining to all the counties (p. 309), and the King's Chamber as keeping a roll (p. 318). Similar slips occur in regard to manorial and honorial courts, and there may be objection in places to a too colloquial style. But such defects will not affect the value of a manual which fulfils the purpose of a general survey and affords a stimulus toward further study.

J. F. BALDWIN.

*The Great Historians: an Anthology of British History arranged in Chronological Order.* By Kenneth Bell, M.A., and G. M. Morgan, M.A. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1925, pp. xvi, 349, \$3.25.) The title of this book naturally invites a comparison with Dr. Charles A. Beard's *Introduction to the English Historians*, noticed in the *Review* nearly twenty years ago. It proves, however, to be cast on a decidedly different plan, though, in a sense, designed to meet the same problems: first, by providing peeps into the promised land to stimulate the young student to further exploration through the works of the masters; and secondly, though this is not featured in the volume just published, by providing a fine type of reading matter for courses inadequately provided with duplicates for collateral reading. To return to the marked difference in treatment, Dr. Beard's *Introduction* is arranged topically and devoted largely to institutions. The new work deals rather with the human factors in history, with striking events, and notable characters. Almost, as rare old Bishop Amyot said of Plutarch, the editors have "chosen the special acts of the best persons, of (one of) the famousest nations of the world".

Each extract—and they rarely run to five or six pages—is prefaced by a short account and estimate of the historian quoted. They include outstanding French and American as well as British names, though naturally the latter are quite in the majority. Considering the limitations of space these brief critical biographies are sound and satisfying. In this part of the work the writers gratefully acknowledge that they have been materially helped by Gooch's *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*. The extracts seem well calculated to stimulate, though

they have no continuity and convey little tangible information. Only the test of experience will show how far they may realize their aim of inducing the average unthirsty students to drink deep in the wells from which fugitive sips are here offered. Only browsing and choosing for oneself will make a real scholar, too many will be content to stop with what this little volume provides; yet if only a few are tempted to go further its purpose will have been achieved.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

*Battles by Sea.* By E. Keble Chatterton. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1925, pp. xv, 271, \$2.50.) This volume purports to "show the connecting principles of sea-fighting through the Galley Age, the Sailing-Ship Age, and the period of Steamships", but the author evidently does not consider that either the action between the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac*, or the first use of steam-driven warships in history (by the United States navy in the War with Mexico), had any significance in the development of sea-fighting. The American navy is, in fact, not even mentioned. The book might have been designed as propaganda for the British Navy League.

EDWARD BRECK.

*A Short History of Gaelic Ireland from the Earliest Times to 1608.* By P. W. Joyce, LL.D., T.C.D., M.R.I.A. (Dublin, Educational Company of Ireland; London, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1924, pp. vii, 565, \$1.75.) There is no lack of histories of Ireland, and especially during and since the war some very good books—some of them covering the subject from the earliest times to our own day, but most and the best of them treating of limited epochs or topics—have been published. There is still need, however, of a readable and at the same time authoritative one-volume history of Ireland, not too large yet embracing all parts of the subject and bringing the researches of the specialists within the reach of all.

Patrick Weston Joyce, the author of the present history, wrote an imposing number of books on the political and cultural history of Ireland. To the former class belong *An Illustrated History*, *A Concise History*, *Outlines*, *A Child's History*, and *A Short History*, all of which, though for the most part rehandlings, and usually in the very words of the same original, have had enormous sales. To the latter class belong the works for which their author will be best remembered, and above all the two stately volumes of more than thirteen hundred pages and more than three hundred illustrations, entitled *A Social History of Ancient Ireland*, abridged in *A Smaller Social History* and in *The Story of Ancient Irish Civilization*. All these works are characterized by the same clear, simple style (the author always having had in mind the student and the classroom) and by the skillful arrangement and the abundance of material.

The present volume, though it bears the date 1924, is only a reprint, under a new title, without the slightest change or improvement, of *A Short History of Ireland from the Earliest Times to 1608* which was first published in 1893. Consequently it has not profited by the solid contributions that have been made to our knowledge of the history of Ireland from every point of view, political, economic, intellectual, and linguistic, during the last three decades, to mention only those of Eoin MacNeill on the earliest period, and of Mrs. Green and Edmund Curtis on the medieval period. A map with Irish letterpress is the only new feature of this book and the only thing to justify its claim to be *A History of "Gaelic" Ireland*. Moreover, the paragraph: "in another volume, which will appear, I hope, in the near future, the narrative will be brought down to the present day", which appears over the initials "P. W. J." in the preface to the first edition and is dated July, 1893, is hardly in place in the (undated) preface to the actual volume (1924), in view of the fact that Dr. Joyce died in 1914.

JOSEPH DUNN.

*History of Russia*. By S. P. Platonov. Translated by E. Aronsberg. (New York, Macmillan and Company, 1925, pp. vii, 435, \$3.50.) Covering the whole course of Russian history, from the early settlements to the present day, this work is necessarily only an outline. It comes from the pen of one of Russia's leading historians, who conscientiously abstained from the political turmoil of his generation. Platonov came from a peasant-workman family, but he became a tutor in the imperial family in addition to his university activities. This combination adds particular interest to the interpretations which he gives in this book, prepared in connection with his direction of the studies of the brother and sister of the Emperor.

Unfortunately we have here mainly a political history. For the early periods the general outlines of economic and social forces are perhaps adequate for the background to the modern period. For the presentation of the modern period this work does not help to fill the gap so keenly felt by those who wish to follow the developments particularly in the nineteenth century. The period of Alexander III. (1881-1894) is covered in four pages, for example.

S. N. HARPER.

*History of Medieval India from 647 A.D. to the Mughal Conquest*. By Ishwari Prasad, M.A., LL.B., History Department, University of Allahabad. (Allahabad, the Indian Press, 1925, pp. xxxix, 602.) This, the "foreword" tells us, is a work intended to fill a position midway between "the elementary text-book and the weighty monograph". The author has made extensive use of both original and secondary sources, and handles his material independently and judiciously. It will do reasonably well as a reference-book for undergraduates in Indian colleges, which is its professed purpose.



It is, indeed, so good that it would have been worth while to make it better. The author affects a very florid style: victories, to him, are regularly "splendid", and defeats "crushing". And at times this magniloquence seems designed to cover up imperfect documentation. Thus, on page 14 we read that King Bhoja won "splendid victories" over Anhilwara and Karnatic—a statement supported only by this note: "It is written in *Prabhand* [read *Prabandha*] *Chintāmani* that Bhoja conquered Anhilwara and Karnatic." There is no exact reference; and nothing to suggest that the text referred to (and misspelled) is full of mere folklore, and that its quasi-historical statements are of very doubtful value. There are not a few signs of carelessness and haste. *E.g.*, on page 65, "Al-Biruni makes no mention of" Delhi, but on page 78, Delhi is included in a list of "the leading kingdoms mentioned by" Al-Biruni. The uninitiated reader will sometimes be confused by the unexplained use of different names, or forms of the same name, for one person (Prithiraj [better Prithvi- or Prithivi-raj], pp. 6, 7, is disguised as Rai Pithaura, p. 8, etc.), and conversely of the same name for different persons in the same context ("Tailap", casually mentioned on p. 32 only, should be distinguished as Tailap III.; we have just been reading on p. 31 of his predecessor Tailap II.). The spelling of proper names and other Oriental words is often sadly inconsistent; in some instances it is almost consistently bad (brahman is regularly spelled "brahaman"! ). Perhaps some bad spellings may be typographical errors, of which the book shows very many more than are noticed in the Errata. The author is conscious of some of these annoying defects, and says by way of apology (p. iii) that he was "busily engaged in University work" when the book was printed and so could not "do full justice" to the proofs: a somewhat surprising excuse, which many scholars in academic life will wish they could safely adopt. The index is woefully incomplete as to proper names, and contains very little else.

These criticisms, it will be noted, refer to defects which the author could certainly have remedied, and which it is to be hoped he will remedy in a later edition. If he had digested, arranged, and documented his material more carefully, there would be little to criticize. That the greater part of the book deals, after all, with wars and petty dynastic affairs, is not his fault in the main, but that of his sources, which give little help towards an economic or social history of the period. Despite the above reflections the work is meritorious, and could be made excellent by the application of more patience and care.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

*Louis XI., King of France, as he appears in History and in Literature.* By Orville W. Mosher, jr., Ph.D. (Toulouse, Édouard Privat, 1925, pp. xii, 321.) It is a little difficult to decide whether this is a work of history or of literary criticism. The author declares that his purpose is to "understand just how good a piece of historical portraiture the great

novelists have succeeded in creating " in respect to Louis XI. He also considers the historians, poets, dramatists, and scenario writers in addition to the novelists. Doubtless for the historians of literature the sources of "information or misinformation" utilized by Scott, Dumas, and Hugo are a matter of interest. For other historical scholars a study of the personality of Louis may be of some significance, and a summary of that monarch's historiography may be useful.

More than half of this book is devoted to translations or summaries of the sources in regard to Louis, and to the author's own estimate of the king's personality. The method of presentation is labored and repetitious, and the results are rather disappointing. There is a suggestion of Plutarch and Suetonius in the series of paragraphs on the king's appearance, daily habits, pleasures, family, friends, servants, his cruelty, religious practices, virtues, sicknesses, and death. The conclusion appears to be that Louis was a disagreeable, unattractive person who "strove with patriotism, devotion, and success in his country's interests". In addition the author asserts that the histories and novels "which affirm that Louis was avaricious, are entirely at fault", that his cruelty, while unquestionable, has been exaggerated, and that his "delightful frankness and bonhomie" have been overlooked. One feels that the prevailing conception of Louis has not been seriously modified. The author is quite justified, however, in his demur from the sentimental enthusiasm with which Christopher Hare (who is entitled to a feminine pronoun) attempts to make Louis a hero. Of the novelists Scott, who receives most attention, is accused of making Louis too much a villain, although his account, as a whole, is "the most living portrayal" of his personality. Hugo's picture is "too dry and hard". Paul Fort, the poet, has exaggerated Louis into a sort of patriotic Hamlet for poetic and dramatic effect. The dramatist Delavigne, although ignoring Louis's good qualities, made a "commendable attempt at historical portrayal", which, unfortunately, proved a failure as a drama.

One sympathizes with the task of proof-reading a work in English for a French press, but persistent gallicisms in technical terms, and particularly in well-known proper names (Bretagne, Normandie, Saint Antoine de Padoue, Laurent de Médicis) are inexplicable. There is an uncritical bibliography and a meagre index.

RICHARD A. NEWHALL.

*Correspondance d'Ottavio Mirto Frangipani, Premier Nonce de Flandre, 1596-1606.* Publiée par Léon Van der Essen, Professeur à l'Université de Louvain. Volume I., *Lettres (1596-1598) et Annexes.* [Analecta Vaticano-Belgica, deuxième série: Nonciature de Flandre, I.] (Rome, Institut Historique Belge; Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. xxxii, 452, 30 fr.) The tons of letters which have passed between the papal secretariat of state and the representatives of the Holy See at foreign courts constitute one of our most precious sources of historical informa-

tion, and it is unfortunate that the difficulties in the way of bringing them together from their various and sometimes quite unexpected hiding-places have rendered their publication slow. Aside from the ecclesiastical and serious political importance of these communications, a collection of the *avvisi* or gossip news-letters which the nuncio was at least in many instances expected to send on to Rome every week, would make fresh, vivid, and stimulating reading.

Erected into an independent nunciature in 1596, two years before the death of Philip II., and at a juncture when Belgium had become a crucial outpost of Catholicism which must be wisely and stubbornly defended against the violent heretic, the Flanders post was first assigned to the Neapolitan prelate Ottavio Mirto Frangipani, who had spent several years in the corresponding charge, also created by him, at Cologne, from which the Flanders nunciature was set off. Frangipani was a consecrated and able ambassador, and handled a difficult situation well, in spite of illness, homesickness—he went to Brussels against his inclination, and his letters return again and again to the plea that he be allowed to go back to a charge in southern Italy—and inadequate financial support. The Popes at this juncture were supporting armies in Hungary, France, and Italy, and, if we may believe Frangipani, they paid the Flanders nuncio even more meagrely and irregularly than his co-workers elsewhere. The three main purposes of his mission were (1) the maintenance and spread of the Catholic faith, (2) the upholding of ecclesiastical liberty, and (3) the advancement of cordial relations between the Church and the Archduke. His serious problem, ceaselessly delicate because fundamentally insoluble, was the reconciling of the papal pretensions with those of the secular local government. (Nothing in the world will put this situation as well as the passage from *Box and Cox*, where those gentlemen propose a division of gain: “I’ll take two-thirds”, says Box. “Very well, I’ll take three-fourths”, says Cox.) It is the highest possible tribute to Frangipani that he stood well, on the whole, with the Archduke.

The admirable Louvain scholar Alfred Cauchie had been working for years on this collection, the material for which was surprisingly scattered, and part of which would probably never have been located if the system-loving Frangipani had not left a careful list of all letters from him and to him; and on Cauchie’s sudden death the work was continued by Professor Van der Essen, well known in this country from his residence in Chicago during the first part of the war. The entire work will comprise several volumes, of which this first one is important more for the editor’s useful introduction than for the small number of letters reached thus far, covering, for the communications from the nuncio, which are much more valuable than those to him, only the first year of his ten years’ incumbency. In work of this sort accurate proof-reading is of the first importance, and it is to be regretted that errors are numerous, one or two of them so serious as to make the text unintelligible.

ROY TEMPLE HOUSE.

*Travel in England in the Seventeenth Century.* By Joan Parkes. (London, Oxford University Press, 1925, pp. xvi, 354, 21 s.) Contributions to historical knowledge—like those to all forms of knowledge, no doubt—seem to run in cycles, according to no rule of reason so far as one can discover. Some one finds a good field to investigate, some one else transfers that idea to another area, and presently we have a whole group of books on some subject or other, until some one finds a new idea. That process is observable in the domain of doctor's dissertations especially in this country—and so the cultivable areas of knowledge are slowly brought under the plough—and sometimes the harrow.

Such a process is observable in the development of what may be called "historical travel books". The accounts of various foreign tourists in the United States at various periods of its development have taken their place in our historical literature, beside those somewhat earlier phenomena of compilations of records of "social" history, relating to the habits, customs, and manners, or lack of them, of our more or less remote ancestors, as incautiously revealed by diaries, account-books, and other material. Of this one of the latest and best examples is this *Travel in England in the Seventeenth Century*, by Miss Parkes, a large, handsome, and well-illustrated volume, with chapters on most things which would be of interest to one who proposed a tour of England in the seventeenth century. We have an account of the land in general, of roads and bridges, of the watch, of carriage by land and water, of inns and alehouses, of highwaymen, and of trials and tribulations, with some account of those who have gone over the road before us; in all, a comprehensive and entertaining chronicle, properly provided with the impedimenta of such a journey—appendixes, bibliography, foot-notes, and index, so that the wayfaring man through these pages, whatever his condition, need not go far astray. Joined to Miss Coates's *Social Life in England* in this same period, to Traill's encyclopaedic work, reinforced by a knowledge of Pepys, Evelyn, Rugg, Luttrell, the *Lives* of the Norths, Carr's map, and perhaps a few other things of like sort, there is now no reason why seventeenth-century England should not become as proper and safe a place for the adventurous holiday-making traveller as any land now advertised by the optimistic and picturesque publicity of the travel bureaus. As one goes through these pages he will find one advantage over even these beckonings to strange far lands. He can travel in seventeenth-century England with even less exertion than in twentieth-century England, and with less expense. He need take only a certain patience and a little imagination, as equipment, and from his own fireside explore not only other lands but other times, till presently, when the whole world is thus charted for him, the library globe-trotter will be as common as the world-tripper is to-day—perhaps with even more advantage to his mind! Moreover as government and politics, constitutions and institutions seem to recede more and more from the pages of history and follow drum and trumpet into oblivion, such works as these may well become the foundations of the knowledge of the

past to future generations less interested in the structure than in the garments of social organization.

*Memoirs of the Verney Family during the Seventeenth Century.* By Frances Parthenope Verney and Margaret M. Verney. Two volumes. Third edition. (London, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1925, pp. xxvi, 582; viii, 576, 21 s.) More than thirty years ago Frances Parthenope, Lady Verney, published the first of four volumes of what has come to be in its field a famous book, the *Memoirs of the Verney Family*, known not only to historical scholars but to a far wider body of readers. It was almost if not quite the first of a long series of such collections of gleanings from letters, diaries, account-books, and miscellaneous papers of English families which have done so much to illuminate the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries of English history. It remains almost if not quite the best of those compilations, as it has been the model for most of them, and it is fortunate that it now appears again in a third edition—which is, in fact, virtually a reprint of the second, issued in 1904—since the constant demand for so valuable and entertaining a chronicle has long since exhausted the earlier issues.

There is perhaps nowhere in England or elsewhere a more extensive and valuable collection of records of a family especially during the seventeenth century than that enormous mass of material so fortunately preserved at Claydon House by the industry of successive generations. One reads with wonder not unmixed with awe of the room forty feet long crammed with papers, of the thirty thousand letters preserved to the date of Sir Ralph Verney's death in 1696. And one interested in the history of the seventeenth century cannot be too grateful for their preservation amid the sad reflections on the fate of so much other material at the hands of less careful owners.

The origin of these volumes gives some clue to their value. The Claydon House papers provided Mr. Bruce material for his volume in the Camden Society entitled *Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament* (1845) from the memoranda of Sir Ralph Verney, and for the volume published by the same society on the *Letters and Papers of the Verney Family down to the End of the Year 1639*. Thereafter the long and loving labors of the former Lady Verney brought together the materials from which the present volumes were composed, with the assistance of the members of her family and friends. The work was completed by the present Lady Verney, and in its present form, besides the introductory chapters relating to the family, covers the whole period of the seventeenth century, the first volume from 1600 to 1659, the second from 1660 to 1696. In its pages live again the great days, the great events, the great characters of a great period; yet this is not its chief charm. That lies in the intimate picture of the life and works of those whose doings it records, the fashion in which life in such a period revealed itself to such a family, the way in which they and their kind spent their time, and in which they recorded and

regarded those about them. Of such a well-known, even in its way such a classic, work as this it is scarcely necessary to say more than that in its field it has no superiors and few rivals as a picture of the period of which it treats, and that not to know it is to a student of that period to argue one's self unknown.

WILBUR C. ABBOTT.

*The English Factories in India, 1665-1667.* By Sir William Foster, C.I.E. (Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1925, pp. vi, 354, 18 s.) Sir William Foster has done once more a valuable record. His previous volumes have filled the student with interest. Now this book seems both to contain his own wit and to express his interest in mundane affairs. Thus there are clear through the documents the problems connected with the acquisition of Bombay by the East India Company. Only later did that corporation discover in dilatory fashion that it had, through a gesture of Charles II., become embarrassed by a seaport of immense strategical importance. There is also the story of the Dowager Queen of Bijapur. This involves various other records which cannot be quoted at present. But in passing we note that "the Queene of Decan, in her retourne from her pilgrimage to Muscat was arrived at Basora; from whome the Bassa there forced 9 thousand tomans, or 30,000 pounds sterling, to make good his present to the Grand Signor" (p. 177). Small wonder, with the mention of such sums, that Englishmen, engaged in the trade of India and of the Persian Gulf, should listen to the jingle of money. At all events they indulged in private trade.

Yet there is quite strongly the note of imperial interest spread on the record. Mingled with reports as to trade there rings out the fighting spirit. Thus the reports of victories in Europe awaken a factor to comment on "the particulars of that bloody encounter, and the valiant resistance our countrymen made, being so few in number, against so powerfull a fleet of the enemyes is ever memorable". It is by such quotation of documents that the generalizations of Sir William Hunter and Sir John Seeley are being destroyed. India was never acquired unconsciously by England. If any student of English seventeenth-century history wishes to gather together the record of the pioneers of imperial interest the way is open. Certainly it would be interesting to see an American cast a search-light on the Navigation Acts and on the assertion of imperial jurisdiction in the East during the latter part of the seventeenth century. The material awaits him in the long series which Sir William Foster and Miss Sainsbury have given to us.

A. L. P. D.

*Campaigners Grave and Gay: Studies of Four Soldiers of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries.* By Lieut.-Colonel L. H. Thornton, C.M.G., D.S.O. (Cambridge, University Press, 1925, pp. vi, 323, 7 s. 6 d.) Colonel Thornton joined the Rifle Brigade in 1895, as a young



man of twenty-two. He took part in the Tochi expedition under General Corrie Bird in 1897. This was an expedition to secure the Tochi valley, one of the chief routes from Afghanistan into the northwestern province of India. For his part in this expedition, he was awarded a medal with clasp. In 1902, he served in South Africa, winning the Queen's Medal with three clasps. From 1908 to the outbreak of the World War he served as adjutant of the Cambridge University Officers' Training Corps and director of military studies in the university. During the World War he received a D.S.O. and a C.M.G.

This little book springs from some biographical lectures, given while he served at Cambridge, in the effort to interest his audience in the study of military history. The lectures were given after dinner, "an hour very suitable to the purpose", he says, "provided always that the lecturer bears in mind that his audience have had a long and busy day, and that in consequence a wholly serious lecture unrelieved by the light touch at frequent intervals is out of place". In his effort to furnish the "light touch at frequent intervals", he took care "to arm himself with some light ammunition, so to speak, in the shape of anecdotes, etc., which might serve to keep the somnolent awake". His success in finding these and incorporating them in his biography testifies to a wide reading and research in the rarely noticed nooks and crannies of military literature.

The book contains sketches of four military figures: Marshal Maurice de Saxe, Major-General Sir Robert Gillespie, Lord Peterborough, and Major-General James Wolfe. Colonel Thornton has been remarkably successful in making these men human. Their personalities, their strength, and their foibles—often especially their foibles—appear clearly and distinctly. The major operations in which they participated are well traced and soundly criticized. Occasionally the author allows himself rather long digressions which mar the unity and continuity of his sketch. On the whole, however, the book is easy and delightful to read.

Students of military history will thank Colonel Thornton for resurrecting these figures of a long dead past, and making them live. Other readers will hardly be interested because, with the exception of Wolfe, their careers in the final analysis will seem to have had little influence on the main course of events.

LUCIUS H. HOLT.

*Le Comte Molé, 1781-1855: sa Vie, ses Memoires.* Par le Marquis de Noailles. Tome quatrième. (Paris, Edouard Champion, 1925, pp. 481, 25 fr.) The memoirs of Count Molé continue their leisurely and watchful way through the adventures and misadventures of the early years of the Restoration. The present volume begins with the departure of the Duke de Richelieu for the Congress at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818 and closes with his final departure from power, the fall of his second ministry in December, 1821. The prevailing characteristics of Count Molé's autobiography have of course been amply revealed as its publica-

tion has proceeded. The fourth volume does not add materially to or alter that revelation. There is the same wealth of information of things important and things trivial, the same insight into character and motive, the same sobriety of judgment, the same grave elegance of expression, the same sound political sense, the same grasp of the realities of the situation in France and in Europe during the period of liquidation and readjustment and recommencement that followed the overthrow of Napoleon.

The narrative is informing, interesting, diverting throughout. We are present at important interviews and ceremonies, we witness the weaving and the dénouement of manifold intrigues. We see slyness and insincerity and double-crossing do their customary work in the perilous field of politics. Events of great pith and moment are fashioned before our eyes and events of slight significance serve to diversify the historic scene. The old régime and the new régime struggle day and night to regain and hold what they have once enjoyed and lost, and that struggle is complicated by Napoleonic elements, enfeebled, discredited, it may be, but still possessing a certain force, and exercising a certain deflective influence.

The embarrassments of the two Richelieu ministries, the attacks, frontal or oblique or subcutaneous, upon them, their slow and agonizing dissolutions, are here set forth in detail. The development of crises, major and minor, goes on apace and is duly chronicled. The art of steering one's way between Ultras and Doctrinaires was one that Molé was forced incessantly to study. A book like this, filled with the thousand and one details of a confused, complex, and constantly shifting political kaleidoscope, cannot be summarized, but it can be cordially commended to anyone wishing to understand the history of France during the three years covered by it. And not only does it render very vivid the variegated vicissitudes of internal affairs but now and then it offers significant glimpses over the wider field of the international relations of the great powers.

A feature of this volume is a number of memoranda for the prime minister or the king, well thought out, intelligent, moderate, acute, in Molé's best manner. There are also several important letters of Molé to Richelieu and of Richelieu to Molé.

Molé's observations and reflections on men and measures are always serious and always merit and reward the attention of the reader.

CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN.

*Johan Sverdrup.* By Halvdan Koht. (Oslo, H. Aschehoug and Company, 1918-1925, three volumes, pp. viii, 522; vi, 297; x, 619.) This is really a political history of Norway in the nineteenth century. It was perhaps inevitable that such should be the case with the biography of her foremost statesman. From the time of Johan Sverdrup's first election to the Storting, in 1850, till his death, forty-two years later, he was a

leader, and for the last twenty years of his life the leader in the fight to maintain the rights of Norway as against Swedish encroachments and to further the cause of democracy. He had no desire to disrupt the union, but he held very strongly that it was a partnership—a doctrine which Sweden refused to accept, with the result that separation could not be avoided.

Brought up in a home where the traditions of the French Revolution were strong, and deeply influenced by English liberalism, Sverdrup early identified himself with the agitation for political and social reform. Among the many reform measures advocated by him we find: trial by jury, local self-government, public elementary education, a national army, factory legislation, extension of the franchise, and responsible government. The last constitutes his chief title to fame. Sverdrup organized the Norwegian liberal party and insisted upon making the Storting supreme in the government of the country. When the cabinet and the king refused to heed the clearly expressed wishes of the electorate, Sverdrup secured the impeachment and conviction of every member of the Conservative ministry in 1884. He then became prime minister, but his earlier successes as chief of the opposition now, in a measure, militated against him, and Oscar II. did not loyally accept the new doctrine of ministerial responsibility. The result was that Sverdrup became separated from his own party, and died abused and persecuted alike by old foes and by former friends.

Professor Koht has painted a full-length portrait of this man who ranks high among the great liberal leaders of the nineteenth century. Johan Sverdrup was a statesman cast in a large mould. Obscure phases of his life and work are made clear by the use of new manuscript material, and by a critical examination of the sources. The work is thorough and scholarly, and it makes valuable contributions to our knowledge of Norwegian history. The progress of liberalism and democracy in Norway is here shown in its relations to the great European movements of that time.

The biography gives a wealth of details and is not easy reading. The task is lightened, however, by good tables of contents. It has numerous excerpts from the sources, many foot-notes, an index, but no bibliography.

PAUL KNAPLUND.

*Deutschland im Kreis der Grossmächte, 1871-1914.* Von Max Lenz. [Einzelschriften zur Politik und Geschichte, XII.] (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1925, pp. x, 90.) In this short book a veteran German historian adds his mite to the chorus of criticism directed against the foreign policy of William II. Bismarck was successful because he understood and allowed for the interests of other powers, and managed "to keep Germany out of all questions which did not directly affect her" (p. 14), whereas "the men of the 'new course' believed that they could not better serve the interests of Germany

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—38.

than by involving her in all questions of world politics" (p. 33) and by putting forward demands for "compensation". But Dr. Lenz does not adopt the current view that all would have been well if the British alliance had been accepted in 1901 or the ambitions of Tirpitz restrained. His criticism is that the grandiose attempt to secure a place in the sun was a mistake. Although it seemed essential for Germany to participate in the territorial scramble that began in 1895, and "the government never had the nation more enthusiastically behind it than when it steered its course in the direction of world policy" (p. 73), this "Weltpolitik ohne Krieg" was really unnecessary. Germany, without good colonies or spheres of influence, was developing more rapidly and successfully than her rivals with world-wide possessions. If only people could have refrained from thinking about the future! "We did not pursue a policy in our own interest, but one for our children and grandchildren" (p. 82). But if expansion was inevitable, then the last place to attempt it was Turkey, for neither Russia nor Great Britain would tolerate a rejuvenation of the Ottoman Empire. It was fatal to forget Bismarck's maxim that "England war überdies unangreifbar und Russland nicht niederzubringen" (p. 25). Whatever may be thought of Dr. Lenz's views, his essay is refreshing from beginning to end and can be cordially commended to students of the "Kriegsschuldfrage".

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

*The Selborne Memorandum: a Review of the Mutual Relations of the British South African Colonies in 1907.* With an Introduction by Basil Williams, Associate Member of All Souls' College, Oxford. (London and New York, Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford, 1925, pp. xxvii, 184, 7s. 6d.) South Africa is a unitary state; Parliament, not the constitution, is supreme; and the four colonies which entered the union might, at the will of the central government, be reduced to the position of French departments or English counties. The national convention of 1908 deliberately rejected Canadian or Australian federalism. Obstacles to union—the existence of two races and two languages, the historical background of antagonism between Boer and Briton, the fresh memories of a bitter war of conquest—gave way before economic considerations. The future prosperity of South Africa required a common control of import duties, railroads, natives (there being five Kaffirs to every white man), cattle diseases and agricultural pests, labor in the mines, and other vital matters. It is with these economic factors and the perils of disunion that the *Selborne Memorandum* deals. Though inferior in literary form, the document must take rank with the Durham report on Canada and the Milner report on Egypt. No understanding of the South African constitution is possible without it.

In his admirable introduction Professor Basil Williams has explained how the *Memorandum* came to be prepared and by what ingenious methods it was given to the public. By 1906, he says, "public opinion was

fully prepared for Union", but "the evils of disunion, while dimly felt, had never been brought home to South Africans in a concrete form that they could grasp". Lionel Curtis, one of the group of young Oxford men whom Milner had enlisted in the work of post-war reconstruction, conceived the idea of stating, with the support of appropriate facts and statistics, the argument for union. The *Memorandum*, drafted by him and submitted to the criticism of fellow-members of the so-called "Kindergarten", was finally revised by Lord Selborne who had succeeded Milner as high commissioner. It still had to be "dropped in the path of South African statesmen", for any appearance of dictation would offend a sensitive public. Fortunately Dr. Jameson, prime minister of the Cape, had full sympathy with the project. He willingly proceeded to suggest the doing of what had already been done. On behalf of his ministry he drew Lord Selborne's attention to "the inadequacy of the present system" and urged him to "review the situation in such a manner that the public may be informed as to the general position of affairs throughout the country". The *Memorandum* was in his hands some five weeks later.

The services of Curtis and his friends did not end there. An interesting passage in the introduction touches on the vigorous propaganda which, through "Closer Union" clubs and pamphlets, through newspapers and magazines, set forth the advantages of union. Public opinion was mobilized. When, in May, 1908, an intercolonial conference met at Pretoria to discuss the tariff and railroad rates, the delegates (as in the case of our Annapolis meeting of 1786) were prepared to recommend the calling of a national convention.

E. M. SAIT.

*International Relations.* By Raymond Leslie Buell. [American Political Science Series, Edward S. Corwin, general editor.] (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1925, pp. xv, 768, \$5.00.) This volume is a study of the science of international relations. It is not a history, though one may find much valuable recent history in it. It is an analysis of "policies which result in the clash of national interests and of methods by which these clashes can be avoided and Peace preserved". The book is divided into three parts: problems of nationalism and internationalism, problems of imperialism, and the settlement of international disputes. The twenty-nine chapters, each of which deals with some particular subject, are filled with pertinent historical instances and references. In fact, several of these chapters, or parts of chapters, are excellent short histories dealing with such topics as reparations and interallied debts, the anti-opium movement, and recent plebiscites. The volume is not, however, a narrative history of international relations. One will look in vain for even a summary of recent events in the Far East, or Europe, or the Americas. One does find that the topics presented, such as the Conflict of Color, Capital and the Backward Regions, and the Open Door, are

illustrated by historical examples from all of these different parts of the world.

One is impressed by the author's breadth of view, the grasp of the subject as a whole, the able marshalling of widely scattered material, and especially by the balanced presentation, the fairness of view, and the judicial-mindedness in dealing with controversial issues. These characteristics are especially noticeable in the chapters dealing with that much-disputed subject, Imperialism. While the evils of many aspects of imperialism are pointed out, it is yet recognized that some foreign control is needed in areas where native governments are clearly unable to maintain the minimum standards of the civilized world. The economic factor is stressed, but not regarded as the sole element in imperialism; there is the urge of the "instinct of possession", and the public in each country is apt to support its government in a contest for dependent territory, from the same motive which leads a crowd to back up its team in a football game.

There are many foot-notes, especially to the best source-material. A good bibliography, by chapters, includes the most important books, pamphlets, and magazine and newspaper articles. These references will be of especial assistance to those who wish to carry on further studies in this field.

Notwithstanding the length of the book, over seven hundred pages, its scope is so extensive that most of its topics can be presented only in the form of a survey, leaving the student hungry for more. To the large number of well-chosen books listed in the bibliography, there might properly be at least a few additions. The topical form of treatment makes some slight repetition of material unavoidable. The number of slips are few: Wei-hai-wei, for example, has not yet been returned to China (page 445), and the Australian "gentlemen's agreement" was first made in 1904, not 1905 (page 66).

The book is interesting, stimulating, and valuable. It gives an unequalled survey of the science of international relations, which is much needed and will be widely welcomed.

GEORGE H. BLAKESLEE.

*Factors in American History.* By A. F. Pollard, M.A., Hon. Litt.D., F.B.A., Professor of English History in the University of London. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1925, pp. vii, 315, \$2.50.) This volume, which embraces a series of lectures delivered in England by Professor Pollard on the Sir George Watson Foundation, is in reality an interpretation of American history. The author states that the lectures were "addressed to English people by one who knew only enough of American history to be aware of his own and popular ignorance". But however great may be popular ignorance in England, a casual survey of the book suffices to show that Professor Pollard himself has a remarkable grasp of the subject. He has read extensively and wisely, and seldom



does he fail to bring to the elucidation of each point the latest and soundest judgments of American historians. And when the facts are not at his command the unfailing instinct of the historian saves him from a full acceptance of false conclusions. Apparently he is unacquainted with Professor Justin H. Smith's *The War with Mexico*, or E. I. McCormac's *James K. Polk*, yet he is obviously suspicious of the old orthodox view that "it was President Polk's purpose from the beginning of his administration to provoke a war with Mexico, in order to have a pretext for seizing California".

It is to be hoped that these lectures will be read extensively in England. They are capable of giving to the British public a grasp and an understanding of American history which it would be hard to obtain from any other English writer. But they should be read also by Americans, for they constitute an interpretation of American history by an Englishman who brings to his task a wide scholarship, a discerning judgment, and an ability to separate truth from propaganda. One is surprised to find how often he goes to the very heart of things. The Civil War he characterizes as "a clash between two incompatible civilizations striving to live together under a common government". The colonists, he explains, were "driven into independence by defense of what they held, and to a large extent rightly held, to be inherited English liberties", and then "reluctantly found themselves under the necessity of evolving a new nation and a new nationality". Such penetrating phrases make it clear that Professor Pollard has not fallen into the error of Lecky, who attempted to explain the Revolution without knowing American colonial history, or of Lord Charnwood, who attempted to explain the Civil War without knowing American history from 1820 to 1860.

*Factors in American History* will be welcomed by Americans who desire to have the unbiassed views of a distinguished foreign scholar upon the vital movements of their history.

THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER.

*The Works of Samuel de Champlain.* Reprinted, translated, and annotated under the general editorship of H. P. Biggar. Volume II., 1608-1613. Translated by John Squair, the French texts collated by J. Home Cameron. [Publications of the Champlain Society, volume XVI.] (Toronto, Champlain Society, 1925, pp. xviii, 351.) Mr. H. P. Biggar and his collaborators of the Champlain Society are proceeding slowly but very surely to make the society's edition of Champlain's works a worthy model of how such a publication should be put forth. A characteristic detail, which is so obvious that it has almost never occurred to editors of similar works, is the provision of a carefully drawn modern map of the same locality on approximately the same scale, alongside each of Champlain's charts. The comparison of these brings out sharply the distinction between a survey and a sketch map. In at least one case, the map of Quebec, the explorer's sketch made three hundred years ago comes much

nearer the visual recollections of an occasional visitor, than Professor Ganong's translineation from the official surveys. The photographs for the illustrations have likewise been very skillfully chosen with a view to showing just what the locality looked like, which the author was trying to describe in words.

Securely tucked away at the end of the recently published second volume are six contemporary documents, the only ones at present known which relate to Champlain's early life. Two, not in the least important but by far the more interesting, are printed for the first time, and if by some turn of good fortune they come to the notice of some one with an active imagination these may supply a sufficiently solid basis for an account of the romance in the explorer's life, assuming that this and his marriage were synonymous. The other four have to do with his voyages. They are reprinted, but seem to have escaped the notice of most writers on Canadian history since they were published in 1879 in the *Archives de Saintonge*.

G. P. W.

*The Jesuit Martyrs of North America.* By John J. Wynne, S.J. (New York, Universal Knowledge Foundation, 1925, pp. xi, 247, \$1.50.) Of those whose lives were sacrificed in evangelizing the Indians of North America, eight French Jesuit martyrs, six priests, and two lay helpers were beatified at Rome, June 21, 1925. In anticipation of the event, Father Wynne gathered together into one complete narrative, mainly from the *Jesuit Relations* by Thwaites, but also somewhat from secondary works, the history of these victims of Iroquois persecution during a war of extermination against the Hurons and the neighboring Tobacco Nation, Indians of New France, amongst whom Jesuits founded and fostered churches under harrowing circumstances. Most of the martyrs were shot or tortured to death on their mission field (1648-1649), but the first group, Goupil (1642) and Jogues and Lalande (1646), were killed by the Mohawks within the present state of New York. No braver men labored, suffered, and died for their faith, and Father Wynne wisely lets the martyrs and their associates tell the tale themselves after his preliminary chapters on the planting of New France and its church and on the formation of the heroes in the mother country by Jesuit training and discipline, in which he stresses well the importance of the *Exercises of St. Ignatius*. The first half of the seventeenth century, when these martyrs lived, furnishes outstanding names in almost every field of Old-World activity. They are marshalled together by Father Wynne in his first chapter, giving a brilliant European background, which, however, is tempered when the narrative mentions the Thirty Years' War in Germany, the Huguenot troubles in France, the brutal persecution of Catholics in England, etc. It does not mention, even fails to take into account, the intolerance of the Calvinistic Dutch Republic. For Father Wynne writes (p. 120): "The hostility to the Jesuits, especially in the

Lutheran countries of Europe, followed them into Huronia through the Dutch settlement at Rensselaerswyck, now Albany." Its Calvinist minister Megapolensis has put on record his hostility in principle to Jesuit mission work amongst the Indians despite all his kindness to Jesuits individually, while Lutherans were of so little account in the Hudson River country that their efforts to organize a church later were absolutely repressed in conformity with general New Netherland intolerance towards dissenting worship outside the family (*cf.* Zwierlein, *Religion in New Netherland*). Notwithstanding a few slips, Father Wynne's volume will rank as the best comprehensive literary monument to the memory of these martyrs of North America.

F. J. ZWIERLEIN.

*The Belgians, First Settlers in New York and in the Middle States, with a Review of the Events which led to their Immigration.* By Henry G. Bayer. (New York, Devin-Adair Company, 1925, pp. xix, 373, \$3.00.) Many commonplaces of history are summarized from Marco Polo to the most recent times, embracing a short history of Belgium, the Reformation, the founding of the Dutch Republic, the Belgic Confession, the acts and operations of Belgians in all walks of life, not omitting the first Lord Baltimore and George Washington as of Belgian descent. Altogether this matter consumes more than half the book. All that might have been said pertinently, if correctly, about the Walloons who came to New Netherland could have been put in a pamphlet.

The author disclaims having written a polemic, asserting that he "has had in view simply the desire to rectify regrettable errors as well as unfortunate popular beliefs". He has corrected some and perpetuated a good many himself. He tells us that "this publication is intended as a souvenir of the tercentenary of the Walloons on Manhattan Island and their settlement in the Middle States". Again and again the author repeats the claim that "in 1623" these French-speaking Belgians founded a settlement on Manhattan Island. It is the peg on which he hangs his title (his thesis), and here he falls down with respect to the year, which was 1624, and the place, which was Fort Orange (now Albany). Whatever former controversial questions may be debatable, the year and place of the first settlement of colonists in New Netherland—sent out by the Dutch West India Company, backed by the authority of the States General—is no longer one of them.

Bayer's book suffers from its special pleading as well as in its inaccuracies. He alleges that he chose "the best authorities and most reputed historians", and he adds: "I simply gathered and reproduced their statements; my work is their own." All the worse for his lack of knowledge of recent writers and documentary discoveries. He relied mainly upon such older writers as O'Callaghan, Brodhead, Mrs. Lamb, and James Grant Wilson, who fell down precisely in respect of the data of first settlements. There is no evidence in his book of acquaintance

with the results of recent scholarship. The following names are wrong—p. 11 (Nuvo Mundo); p. 139 (twice Brodhead is wrong); p. 148 (Nieu Nederlandt); p. 151 (Novi Belgi); p. 190 (Vingsoon); p. 191 (Windsor); p. 201 (Kief); p. 321 (Kryn Fredrick); pp. 342, 344, 347 (Grist); p. 346 (Nicaise); p. 349 (Hemstead). The index is quite incomplete.

VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS.

*The Delaware Finns, or the First Permanent Settlements in Pennsylvania, Delaware, West New Jersey, and Eastern Part of Maryland.* By E. A. Louhi. (New York, Humanity Press, 1925, pp. 331, \$4.75.) When I opened this book I expected to find an account of the few "pure Finns" who were sent to New Sweden, or of those who later came of their own accord. Instead of that I was confronted by a propaganda book, more fantastic in its statements than most of the propaganda books which appeared during the war. After informing us in the introduction (pp. 7-8) that the culture and civilization of Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, etc., came from the Finns (he maintains that the Finns and the Ural-Altaic peoples are the same, first sentence on p. 7), he gives us a paraphrase of Johnson's *Swedish Settlements* for the period 1638 to 1664. Then he draws from Norberg and one or two other sources, always of course substituting "Finnish" for "Swedish". For good measure he throws in a few absurdities here and there, perhaps thus to show his learning. He tells us, for instance, that the inscription of the mysterious hand at the feast of Belshazzar, "Mene, mene", etc., was Finnish!! Poor old Daniel did not know what he was talking about!!! Will not this be a revelation to the Hebrew and Aramaic scholars of the world, who, in their innocence, did not know that a Finnish witch-doctor was present in the palace of the famous Babylonian king! But perhaps Mr. Louhi had better look in Davies, *Hebrew and Chaldaic Lexicon to the Old Testament* (pp. 301, 522, 697), before he writes anything else about the subject. He also reveals to us some very startling ethnographic "facts" about the Indians. Let the American archaeologists beware! Moccasins were not, as some of us believe, of Indian origin; they were, according to Mr. Louhi, borrowed from the Delaware Finns (p. 233). The Indians, poor things, presumably ran about barefooted before the Finns came here in 1638 and showed them how nice it was to wear moccasins, especially in cold weather, with snow on the ground! Why not make the Indians the descendants of the Delaware Finns? That would settle the whole matter, shoes and all. Mr. Louhi has also discovered that the Indians found the Finnish language so beautiful and fascinating that they adopted many Finnish words and gave Finnish names to their chiefs and heroes! Tamanen (still famous through Tammany Hall of New York) does not mean "the affable", "the kind", as chief Tamanen and his Indian subjects believed. No, Mr. Louhi has discovered that it is Finnish and means "mare horse" (p. 233)! "Mare horse" must be a weird kind of an animal found in Finland and known only to Mr. Louhi; or does

he possibly mean "mare", the female of the horse? But why call a perfectly masculine Indian chief "mare"?

Mr. Louhi's English, in this amazing book, is as wonderfully and fearfully made as his "facts".

AMANDUS JOHNSON.

*Sketches of Eighteenth Century America: More "Letters from an American Farmer"*. By St. John de Crèvecoeur. Edited with introductions by Henri L. Bourdin, Ralph H. Gabriel, and Stanley T. Williams. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1925, pp. 342, \$4.00.) This handsome volume contains several heretofore unpublished papers by St. John de Crèvecoeur, the "American Farmer". These were secured by the present editors from the descendants of Crèvecoeur in France. They constitute a valuable supplement to the *Letters from an American Farmer* which has appeared in so many editions. There are new and valuable items on the agricultural methods of America in the latter half of the eighteenth century to be found under such captions as: A Snow Storm as it Affects the American Farmer; Farm Life; Enemies of the Farmer; Customs; Implements. There are seven papers that touch the American Revolution: the vicissitudes of the Loyalists; the depredations upon the frontier by Indians and Loyalists; "The Wyoming Massacre", etc. Crèvecoeur himself was Tory in sentiment but he delineates both sides of the pattern.

Since there is so much of historical value in the book one wishes it had been edited more in historical fashion. It is not printed verbatim, and changes in the text are by no means fully indicated (to judge by the statement of the editors, p. 37). Explanatory annotations are few and far between, where more of them would have been a boon even to an inquisitive lay reader. The index is woefully inadequate. Such headings as Negro, Politics, Religion, Cattle, France—have numerous page entries with no analysis.

The reviewer does not understand why the present editors have treated Dr. Julia Post Mitchell in such cavalier fashion. Her biography of Crèvecoeur (1916) was a real contribution, the result of much painstaking research. It is not true that Dr. Mitchell "remained silent" (p. 20) concerning the existence of further Crèvecoeur papers (see Mitchell, *Crèvecoeur*, p. xii). Again, it is hardly good literary sportsmanship to quote her as saying "the whole case hangs" on the letter of Lotbinière (p. 15 n.), when she actually says, "perhaps the whole case hangs" (Mitchell, *Crèvecoeur*, p. 20). There are other phrases that good grace would have replaced with a word of generous recognition for the labors of the earlier author. Incidentally, the above-mentioned letter of Lotbinière, for which Dr. Mitchell searched in vain, is here printed (p. 15 n.) without any indication of where the original is to be found.

In fine, here is a sheaf of new Crèvecoeur papers of literary, philological, and historical interest. They have been edited avowedly (p. 36) to

avoid "endless annotations and explanations" and "to make the manuscript readable". The aim "to retain scrupulously Crèvecoeur's meaning" will not be quite satisfying when students of history wish to seize upon a definite fact. Then the question is sure to arise: "Is this what Crèvecoeur actually said?" Historians will keep on wishing that the historical value of the papers had been kept more largely in view.

R. W. KELSEY.

*The Papers of Sir William Johnson.* Prepared for publication by the Division of Archives and History, Alexander C. Flick, Ph.D., Litt.D., Director and State Historian. Volume IV. (Albany, University of the State of New York, 1925, pp. xvi, 898, \$2.50.) This is the fourth volume of the published series of *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*, which is being undertaken by the state of New York. Readers of the *American Historical Review* will find in the July, 1923, issue of this journal (volume XXVIII., no. 4, pp. 758-760) an extended notice, by Professor McIlwain, of the first three volumes of the series. That review of the history, significance, and present status of the Johnson papers should be read in connection with the present brief notice.

The present volume is a concrete illustration of the irreparable loss to historical scholarship through the not infrequent fires which destroy our public buildings and ravage our historical sources. For example, the editor has printed, in chronological sequence throughout the volume, abstracts of missing letters and documents as found in the *Calendar of the Sir William Johnson Manuscripts*, published in 1909. These missing items number approximately 1108. The volume contains, in all, about 413 papers, but 172 of these do not form a part of the Johnson collection, but have been drawn from other sources. Out of the 241 Johnson papers included in the volume, 107 are more or less seriously damaged by fire. There remain, therefore, only 136 items in a complete state of preservation out of a total of 1351 papers. This is for the three-year period, from January, 1763, to the end of December, 1765. In a number of cases, only the draft was preserved. About forty papers, which were completely destroyed, are reproduced from printed and other sources.

The central figure in all the transactions referred to in the volume is Sir William Johnson, whose service as superintendent of Indian affairs in the northern district was concerned with the difficult and perilous task of reconciling such varied and contradictory interests of that day as those of the empire, the aggressions of white settlers on Indian lands, the speculative activities of great mercantile houses, and the jealous and resentful Indian nations. The lines of his correspondence extended to the commander-in-chief of the British forces in North America, to the Board of Trade, to governors of the northern and middle colonies, to his own subordinates, and to personal friends. Indian trade and its regulation, boundary lines, Indian wars and peace negotiations, white settlements, and Indian land grants are the central themes of the correspondence.



The workmanship and scholarly care with which the volume has been edited and published is quite above criticism. There is, however, neither index nor calendar.

C. E. CARTER.

*Jefferson et les Idéologues d'après sa Correspondance Inédite avec Destutt de Tracy, Cabanis, J.-B. Say, et Auguste Comte.* Par Gilbert Chinard, Professeur de Littérature Française à l'Université Johns Hopkins. [Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1925, pp. 296, \$2.00.) Professor Chinard has published a number of studies to show the influence of America in French literature. For the present volume he has collected some sixty or seventy letters (most of them letters between Jefferson and Destutt de Tracy) written during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, for the purpose of showing how the ideas of the French "Idéologues" were spread in America, and, more particularly, how the ideal of American, that is to say Jeffersonian, democracy was spread in France. Far indeed (and this is perhaps the author's main thesis) was De Tocqueville from being an innovator, revealing to his contemporaries an unknown political world; on the contrary he did no more than to continue and complete "the work of the Ideologues who, for so many years, had never ceased to consider the United States as the hope and example of the universe". The letters are interesting, but I think the author has made too much of a little. The influence of books is a treacherous subject, particularly so when the evidence is largely confined to the amenities of correspondence between distinguished men who know each other none too well. I gather after all only that Jefferson lavished some of his inexhaustible interest in the currents of thought on French writers of the second order, and that certain French intellectuals still cherished the ideal America and admired Jefferson as its symbol. But really, I think, the "influence" of Jefferson and the Ideologues, in both countries, was a waning one—a slowly dying refrain of eighteenth-century optimism. At the time of Jefferson's death, Americans for the most part, North and South, were preparing to apologize for him on the ground that he had been led astray by "French atheistical philosophy". And as for De Tocqueville, that gloomy forecaster of impending evils looks to me quite out of place sitting in Jefferson's gallery. Surely he never regarded it as his business to promote democracy in the world. The good God, for purposes doubtless known to himself since they were inscrutable to human intelligence, had done that quite sufficiently; and he, De Tocqueville, wrote his great book to show Frenchmen how an intolerable "equality of conditions" might be in some measure eased off for sensitive souls, how it might be checked and balanced and nullified on behalf of "liberty"—the liberty of the better sort to go on being the better sort. De Tocqueville is not of the school of Jefferson or the Ideologues. He belongs with Hamilton and Bonald really—aristocrats all, each endeavoring in his own

way to erect barriers against a devastating flood, which seemed to Jefferson only a placid stream flowing between green banks.

CARL BECKER.

*The Kentucky Land Grants.* A Systematic Index to All the Land Grants recorded in the State Land Office at Frankfort, Kentucky, 1782-1924. By Willard Rouse Jillson, Sc.D., State Geologist of Kentucky. [Filson Club Publications, no. 33.] (Louisville, Kentucky, The Standard Printing Company, 1925, pp. xi, 1844, \$30.00.) Although the title indicates its main purpose, this rather portly volume is much more than a comprehensive index to the 143,228 land grants in the Kentucky Land Office. In addition to a systematic and usable guide to this mass of material, Dr. Jillson has compiled many details of much importance to the historian. The value of his work, too, has been much enhanced by an introductory chapter which explains the origin, the period, and the approximate location of each type of Kentucky grants. Still another important aid in using this material is a list of counties, with the date of establishment of each, and the district from which it was set off.

The difficult problem of arranging so many details in systematic fashion, Dr. Jillson has worked out in quite successful fashion, arranging the long list of grants according to their classification in the Kentucky Land Office. Beginning with the Virginia Grants, each type follows in chronological order. Within each class the names of the patentees are listed alphabetically, with ample references to the original documents. Also, such important details have been inserted as the number of acres and the date of survey of each grant, together with the county, and the watercourse on which it lay. Grants under the military bounty acts have been designated specially, and for patents to the public lands west of the Tennessee River the township and range have been indicated.

This volume upholds the high standard of the Filson Club Publications, and will be an important aid to the worker in the economic, and especially the agricultural, history of the early West as well as of Kentucky. Indeed, it is just such exact and even wearisome work as this that is necessary, if early Western history is to be constructed upon a really sound basis. It is to be hoped, therefore, that Dr. Jillson's example will be followed by the publication of similar material for other states of the Ohio Valley.

B. W. BOND, JR.

*Genesis and Birth of the Federal Constitution: Addresses and Papers in the Marshall-Wythe School of Government and Citizenship of the College of William and Mary.* Edited by J. A. C. Chandler, Ph.D., LL.D., President of the College of William and Mary. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1924, pp. xii, 397, \$2.50.) This volume comprises a course of lectures given at the College of William and Mary early in 1921, on the occasion of the inauguration at that institution of the John Marshall Chair

of Constitutional History and Law and the George Wythe Chair of Government and International Law. The contributors are for the most part men whose reputation lies outside the realm of original and exact scholarship and the character of the volume is stamped by this fact. It will be of slight value to the student, and even for the lay reader it will be apt to prove more edifying than educative. Particularly has the opportunity been seized by some of the eminent speakers to inveigh against a supposed extension of national power at the expense of states' rights; also, to reinstate the Anglo-Saxon theory of the origin of the jury and of representative institutions.

*The Memoirs of a Cape Cod Skipper.* By Elijah Cobb, with a foreword by Ralph D. Payne. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1925, pp. 111, \$1.50.) Captain Cobb played an active and interesting rôle in many of the situations which made American commerce at once lucrative and risky during the first three decades after the Revolution. He dodged the Algerine pirates only to have his ship seized by a French frigate, but he secured its release from Robespierre himself. He successfully bribed a British official at Gibraltar when the Orders in Council suddenly shut down on the trade in which he was engaged. A year later, he hustled a cargo out of Norfolk in the teeth of the Embargo. Cobb learned of the War of 1812 only when he was captured off the Grand Banks and sent to Halifax a prisoner. There were other adventures, for this staunch old Universalist was a smuggler on occasion and could hold his own in the financial intrigues of Hamburg. There is almost nothing of the turbulence of seas and crews which is to be found in regular sea stories, for Cobb was primarily a business man afloat, and his main interest lay in the adroitness which he displayed on the occasions where he ran afoul of the commercial regulations of the nations in those troublous times. The little book makes a pleasant evening's reading, but it will also be of value to the lecturer or writer who can find in Cobb's episodes valuable and vivid source-material illustrative of the manner in which scores of New England fortunes were amassed. The memoirs end abruptly in 1812 and the remainder of Cobb's life as an African trader and a magnate of the community at Brewster is related in letters and a grandson's notes. The editor has included facsimiles of a typical bill of lading and a list of port charges. The foreword, written in Mr. Payne's lucid style, affords a good background for the commerce of the period, but he skims the cream of Cobb's short account by anticipating too many of the skipper's best stories, so that they have lost their freshness for the reader when he comes upon them in the original.

ROBERT G. ALBION.

*The Development of the Organisation of Anglo-American Trade, 1800-1850.* By Norman Sydney Buck, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Political Economy in Yale University. (New Haven, Yale University

Press, 1925, pp. xii, 190, \$2.50.) Professor Buck has encountered unusual difficulty in undertaking a study, the purpose of which was to "investigate the methods of the buying and selling entering into trade between the United States and Britain at the opening of the nineteenth century, and to trace the developments and modifications through the period from 1800 to 1850". Business records which should furnish an important original source for such a study are rarely available in such form as to be usable to the historical scholar. While the author has had access to a few such records it has been necessary for him to utilize parliamentary hearings, contemporary newspapers, and secondary sources both during that period and later, in order to piece out evidence as to the commercial structure and its development.

In carrying out his plan the first chapter is devoted to an examination of the types of middlemen functioning in Anglo-American trade at the opening of the nineteenth century. This is followed by a study of the cotton market, to which two chapters are devoted, the first taking the commercial organization of the cotton market in Britain, the second, the organization of that market in the United States. The last three chapters are devoted to the study of trade in British manufactures with America in the three periods, 1815, 1830, and 1850.

In spite of the admitted relationship between commercial and other development, commercial organization has been accorded less attention than less important fields, than, for instance, the history of banking, an institution whose function it is to serve the commercial organization. The fact that ordinary commercial organization has not come into the political limelight, the lack of realization of the importance of the commercial structure and its development, and the difficulty of securing first-hand materials for its study, explain in part this neglect. Professor Buck's study is, therefore, an important contribution to the history of business. But many other studies will have to be made before we have fairly complete and authentic knowledge of the historical development of American commercial organization.

H. R. TOSDAL.

*William Allen, a Study in Western Democracy.* By Reginald Charles McGrane, Ph.D., Professor of History, University of Cincinnati. (Columbus, Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1925, pp. 279, \$2.50.) It would seem that a valuable biographical work should have for its subject a person distinguished in some field of human activity. The author of this book did not have such a character. Therefore, the work will not attract attention because of any great interest in the life of William Allen. At every crisis of American history through which Allen passed, he grasped the temporarily popular, Western, Ohio Valley view of an issue and went down with a lost cause. His public life was limited to one term in the House of Representatives (1833-1835), two in the Senate (1837-1849), and one as governor of Ohio (1874-1876). When the

Maine boundary question was an issue, he thought "a war with England would be beneficial to the Democracy". On the Oregon question, his zeal for expansion outran that of President Polk. When Polk came to court compromise, Allen the "irreconcilable" broke with the administration and lost much of his influence in the Senate. In the Civil War he was won over to the movement of Northwest Democrats for a peace by compromise. In 1873 the Ohio Democrats, harking back to happier days of the party, made their staunch old Jacksonian governor of the state, but then he ran off in a faction of his party with the greenback panacea, only to go down to defeat once again. He was never a statesman, and seldom even a first-class politician.

The author of this book has not pretended that Allen was greater than he was. His justification for a biography is explained in the subtitle—"A Study in Western Democracy". As an occasion for studying the Jacksonians in Ohio and their reaction in changing times, the subject is not bad. The author has chosen to quote extensively from Allen's letters and speeches and from those of his contemporaries. It is a matter of opinion whether the practice of incorporating long quotations in the text is overdone. Those who are looking for a source-book on Ohio phases of the Jacksonian movement will approve the author's course. There is not such a justification for his tendency to employ contemporary, exaggerated estimates of Allen's oratory or statesmanship. Phrases that say "The effect of Allen's speech was miraculous", or that he struck a "responsive chord in every true American breast" raise queries as to the author's critical judgment. They are unfortunate, for there are many paragraphs of a clear, critical kind estimating Allen's achievements which correct the first impressions. The severest criticism is that the extensive quotations and the apparent endorsement of local opinion mar the clearness of the narrative. As a picture of frontier Jacksonians the book has a real value. It is not a beautiful picture, that of this frontier trying bravely to realize democracy, handicapped by a low level of general enlightenment, but it is one that historians need to see. The author has provided illuminating foot-notes and an extensive bibliography. These, with several useful maps and an adequate index, add distinctly to the usefulness of the study.

ELBERT J. BENTON.

*The Southern Plantation Overseer as revealed in his Letters.* By John Spencer Bassett, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of American History on the Sydenham Clark Parsons Foundation in Smith College. [Smith College Fiftieth Anniversary Publications.] (Northampton, printed for Smith College, 1925, pp. vii, 280, \$3.65.) Among the papers of James K. Polk preserved in the Library of Congress there are many letters relating to his plantation affairs. Most of them were written by the successive overseers; and in exploiting them Professor Bassett has made the personality, problems, and policies of these men his central theme. The book is an extremely concrete study, with nearly two hundred letters in their

pristine crudity spread upon its pages. Two of the originals reproduced in facsimile suggest the difficulties of deciphering. The work is admirably done; and it was well worth doing. The result is a more cogent picture of workaday plantation life than has previously been available. Incidentally it suggests a good deal of runaway life, and illustrates the dilemma which overseers and planters constantly faced. If control were slack, the slaves would skimp their work; if control were harsh, some of them would flee, and some of the fugitives would find means to appeal to the master, who must decide on doubtful evidence the question of justice and policy. Generally the overseers were supported, but two of them lost their jobs because of their severity to the slaves.

The Polk plantation of chief concern, in Yalobusha County, north-western Mississippi, was begun as a wilderness clearing in 1835, when a house for the overseer, four slave cabins, and other structures were built in eighteen January days. Life upon it was then extremely crude; and life upon it remained crude throughout the quarter-century of its ownership by President Polk and his widow, for neither master nor mistress ever graced the place by residence upon it. Except for one letter from a slave, printed on pages 161-162, these Polk papers show little of the mellow side of slavery. But they show the overseers' life and character from nearly all angles, and the exhibit is such as to engage Professor Bassett's esteem for these functionaries.

A supplementary chapter treats the relations of the plantation with factors at New Orleans; and throughout the book there are fairly copious data upon crops and routine, sickness and health, births and deaths, steamboats and keelboats, fires and sinkings, buying and selling, hiring and firing, profit and loss. The book, in its handsome dress, is a notable contribution to our knowledge of the slave-plantation régime.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

*John Slidell.* By Louis Martin Sears, Professor of History in Purdue University. (Durham, N. C., Duke University Press, 1925, pp. 252, \$2.50.) Some authors make the preface a guide to reviewers, but Professor Sears reserves appraisal of his book to the penultimate page of the text. He there admits, perhaps too modestly, that he has offered little to change the conceptions of Slidell's missions to Mexico and France or of his influence on secession. On the other hand he says: "It is possible that Slidell's connection with Buchanan and the large share which he had personally in the election of 1856 and in the subsequent policies of Buchanan are here revealed more fully than before." That Slidell was Buchanan's Warwick is quite demonstrated, but the chapter entitled *The Power behind the Throne* gives the impression that, except as regards the patronage, there was little force whether in or behind that structure while Buchanan was its occupant.

More might have been made of several matters. The complexities of Louisiana life and politics could have been illuminated from the great



mass of local newspaper files in the archives room of the City Hall at New Orleans, and comparisons might have been made between Slidell's policies and those of his prominent Southern contemporaries. As it is, the atmosphere of the book is of Washington and Saratoga, not of New Orleans and White Sulphur Springs. More is said of Douglas and Marcy than of Davis or Yancey; and even Soulé and Benjamin are given mere passing notices. Slidell himself is appraised as a polished man, a prosperous lawyer, a worthy public servant never pretending to be a tribune of the people, and a deft manipulator of political apparatus. It would be interesting to inquire whether his predilection for the committee room as against the rostrum may be attributed to his urban origin in New York and his urban career in New Orleans. In having no roots in the open spaces he was almost alone among the public men of his time.

The book is essentially a narrative. The phrasing is generally good and sometimes distinguished. No chapter is dull except that upon the Confederate mission to France, which is overladen with quoted matter. The format is excellent. The only typographical error noted occurs in Buchanan's name in the index.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

*State Rights in the Confederacy.* By Frank Lawrence Owsley, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History, Vanderbilt University. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1925, pp. ix, 275, \$2.50.) The thesis of this monograph is that the Confederacy fell primarily because of obstructions due to state rights sentiment. The author makes out a strong case. If the reader denies that state interference with the activities of the central government was *the* determining factor in the collapse of the Confederacy, he is compelled to admit that it was *a* determining factor. As he reads the record here set forth he marvels that the Confederacy endured so long.

The study is based upon most of the printed sources of the period, especially the *Official Records*. One misses citations of the Confederate and state collections of statutes and of the various collections of manuscript sources, especially the Confederate archives in the Library of Congress. Five phases of the multifarious omissions and commissions are considered: Local Defense; Relations of the States to their Troops in the Confederate Service; Suspension of the Writ of Habeas Corpus; Conscription; Impressment of Property. While this plan occasions some repetition it promotes clarity. The "conclusion" is really a summary of the previous chapters.

Generally the tone is judicious and fair, though the author seems to feel that the actions of such men as Governors Brown of Georgia and Vance of North Carolina and the Stephens-Toombs faction in Congress were dictated solely by a desire to spite Davis, instead of by a mistaken idea of the best means of defending their states. The style is straightforward and interesting, and usually clear, despite occasional obscurities. Omitting the name (Magrath) of the governor of South Carolina on

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—39.

pages 213 and 260 gives the impression that his predecessor was responsible for the action there related. It is stated, on page 257, that South Carolina enacted a law *December 23, 1864*, to obstruct the impressment of slaves. Three pages farther Florida is said to have "followed" this example by passing a similar law *December 7*. Likewise the statement (page 279) that Brown was supported by "Vice-Presidents Stephens and Toombs" leaves an erroneous impression. There are several such errors of style and proof-reading.

After all deductions are made the fact remains that Mr. Owsley has done a creditable and valuable piece of work. Incidentally he has revealed how much good ore is still unmined in the *Official Records*.

MILLEDGE L. BONHAM, JR.

*Elmer E. Ellsworth and the Zouaves of '61*. By Charles A. Ingraham. (Chicago, Chicago Historical Society, 1925, pp. xi, 167, \$2.00.) "This work is the result of a conviction that there exists generally a misapprehension concerning the character and public services of Ellsworth" (preface, p. ix). As the author asserts (*ibid.*), it is based mainly on original sources; in a large degree, therefore, it is a source-book.

As historical literature the book is a delight. It is beautifully printed, well illustrated, and gripping in interest. The author accomplishes his purpose in revealing in an unforgettable way the career of Ellsworth and the character of his military organizations.

As an historical monograph the publication is not so satisfactory. The title is misleading. What does the author mean by "the Zouaves of 1861"? The body of the text (pp. 17-112) is taken up with the Chicago Zouaves of 1859-1860, an organization which was formally disbanded in October, 1860 (p. 113). The attention given here is doubtless responsible for its publication by the Chicago Historical Society. The only Zouaves of 1861 given any treatment at all by the author are the New York Fire Zouaves (p. 127 ff.), of whom Ellsworth himself had little reason to be proud.

The absence of exact notation as to the date, title, and location of a given original source of information in such works as this is highly annoying. Examples in this work are too numerous to mention. Particularly annoying is the use of newspapers which are not even mentioned. The famous Zouave tour of 1860 is described from newspaper reports with exact references rarely given, and sometimes in the language of the original without acknowledgment by quotation-marks or otherwise. Some slight lack of unbiassed historical attitude on the part of the author appears in the last pages of the book. The use of the word "assassin" (p. 155) begs the question at issue. The inclusion of John Brown, Elmer E. Ellsworth, and Abraham Lincoln in "that patriotic and prophetic triad of martyrs who still breathe inspiration into the hearts of this Republic" will not meet universal approval.

ALFRED PROCTER JAMES.

*Six Years with the Texas Rangers, 1875-1881.* By Captain J. B. Gillett. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1925, pp. 259, \$4.00.) It is a real pleasure to follow Mr. Gillett through his *Six Years with the Texas Rangers*. The book has in it the essential merit of a plain statement out of actual experience, but nevertheless romantic and true, in the main, to the fundamentals that go to make up history.

The book's chief interest lies in the fact that it is a chronicle touching the last frontier of the United States. Perhaps there is hardly any phase in the evolution of a nation that carries with it so much of the picturesque as does the frontier. It is there that we see the forces of civilization working towards a definite destiny. In these evolutionary processes, so far as the United States is concerned, the Texas rangers played an important part.

It is difficult for modern Americans to conceive of a strip of land a thousand miles long by five hundred miles wide, or, let us say, 500,000 square miles of territory, all but uninhabited save by freebooters and redskins. That was the domain where the Texas ranger made his reputation. The Texas rangers were organized prior to the independence of the country from Mexico; they have had almost a hundred years of continuous activity.

They were at first concerned with maintaining law and order among the early colonists in the Mexican province of Texas, and after that they had to do with the Indians and Mexicans who encroached upon and robbed the pioneers; and finally, they had to deal frequently with feuds among the ranchers and the early settlers. Even to-day the Rio Grande frontier is still the scene of their operation, where they are engaged in suppressing the horse-thief and the smuggler.

The Texas rangers, true to their fighting tradition, became the Terry rangers of Civil War days and gave splendid account of themselves.

All in all, the story of these pioneer peace-preservers is one hard to match in the frontier annals of America. Mr. Gillett has rendered a real service to students of American frontier life, and to the country, in preserving his record so faithfully.

WALTER F. MCCAULEY.

*Notes and Anecdotes of Many Years.* By Joseph Bucklin Bishop, Litt.D. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925, pp. 236, \$2.50.) This small volume is a loosely woven fabric composed of odds and ends collected through the period of a lifetime. There are a few stories about Horace Greeley, Henry Ward Beecher, John Hay, E. L. Godkin, and Theodore Roosevelt, and about a few less well-known characters. The volume is not intended, probably, to add anything to our present knowledge of these men. In the case of Roosevelt, especially, well-worn anecdotes are retold, like Lord Morley's comparison of Niagara Falls and the exponent of the strenuous life. And although the author starts with the resolve to exhibit the Colonel "as a man, not as a superman", the promise is promptly forgotten in a crush of superlatives.

Many of the anecdotes seem to fall in the category of stories which "well illustrate a point", but may or may not be quite authentic. Some of them relate to conversations fifty or fifty-five years old, which are here repeated in direct discourse. Perhaps the author himself comments most wisely on the degree of reliance to be placed on them: "Of the anecdotes that I shall record, I feel justified in saying that all of them are reasonably authentic and most of them are based upon my personal knowledge. Time and the fallibility of human memory may have put extra touches upon some of them, but I shall cite none that I do not believe to be veracious . . ." (p. 7).

C. R. L.

*The Confessions of a Reformer.* By Frederic C. Howe. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925, pp. viii, 352, \$3.00.) This book does not classify readily as either autobiography or history. It is too uncritical and too little documented to be the latter; it is too sketchy and philosophical to meet the requirements of the former. It is really a somewhat pessimistic essay on reform, by a reformer who has come in middle life to doubt the truth of the formulas on which his earlier activity was based. Mr. Howe can no longer accept the liberal notion of progress through disinterest and patriotism. His suspicion of wealth, blood, and position makes him distrust whatever emanates from the well-to-do. Their class-selfishness vitiates their efforts. And so he turns to labor militant as the present mainspring of reform. A captious critic might perhaps inquire whether the self-interest of one class is less safe as a guide than that of another; but Mr. Howe sees no inconsistency here, and writes with frankness and sincerity of the past generation as he has seen it from the various posts of observation that he has held. He does a real service. There is no more inspiring struggle for the maintenance of democratic government in the United States than the one which derived its philosophy from the gropings of the Populists, and its patriotism from the era of the centennial celebrations of the 'eighties of the last century. The author came from a boom section in western Pennsylvania, where the economic upsets from petroleum started early reflections upon the reasonableness of business, and the relation of business to government. He went to Johns Hopkins while it contained the spirit of youth, with Adams, Ely, and Wilson ascendant; and he has here recorded much that is of value for the reconstruction of a university that was one of the most active germinating spots in America. He went west to Ohio, and came into close contact with another germinating group that faced American problems at the beginning of this century, with "Golden Rule" Jones, Tom Johnson, Brand Whitlock, Newton D. Baker, and Marcus A. Hanna in the foreground, and with John P. Altgeld, Louis F. Post, and Robert M. LaFollette not too far away. He was close to the struggle that disrupted the Republican party, and close also to the Wilson administration that harvested where the progressives had sown the seed. The *Confes-*

sions will not add many new facts for the student of their period, but they will help to show the proportions of the persons and the issues that provide the detail for a picture of our last quarter-century.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

*America and Germany, 1918-1925.* By Sidney Brooks. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1925, pp. xviii, 191, \$1.50.) Mr. Brooks has previously published *America and Poland, 1915-1925*, and *Russian Railroads in the National Crisis*. The present volume deals primarily with American and incidentally the Allied food relief of Germany and other war-racked countries of Central Europe after the armistice (chapters I. to VI.), and the work of the American Relief Administration in co-operation with the Society of Friends in feeding and caring for German children in 1919-1922 (chapter IX., the Salvage of a New Generation). What is said of Germany's internal struggles leading to the Weimar constitution, her naïve expectations of financial credits from America, and the Dawes plan and its working, is quite sketchy and shows little trace of first-hand knowledge. Indeed, the giving of all credit for the Dawes solution to "the inspired and constructive work of General Charles G. Dawes" and his American associates shows not only the usual American complacency with reference to our part in European reconstruction, but also a certain unfamiliarity with the documents.

In justice to the author, however, it should be said that this is not his usual attitude. In general he gives hearty recognition to Britain's important part in Continental relief, and shows a rather shrewd appreciation of German policy in putting men with American knowledge and experience in strategic government positions. The main portion of the book is interesting and valuable, and shows a familiarity with the work of the American Relief Administration and the Allied Supreme Economic Council which suggests first-hand knowledge. The difficulties presented by the economic blockade up to the signing of the peace, the problems connected with the use of German shipping, and the German task of financing the food shipments are adequately and sympathetically treated. Among the valuable features of the book are numerous extracts from documents, including a number of illuminating letters and memoranda by Mr. Hoover, for whom the author rightly has a great admiration. Unfortunately there is no index.

S. B. H.

*A Brief History of the Constitution and Government of Massachusetts.* By Louis Adams Frothingham, LL.B. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1925, pp. v, 154, \$1.50.) Although written by a former lieutenant-governor of Massachusetts and speaker of the house, this book is concerned almost wholly with the external envelope of government. Students of such matters will find a careful account of "Filing Petitions and Bills", "How Bills are Introduced", and the like, in the chapter on

legislative procedure. The historical part is a mere outline, which conveys no suggestion of the dynamic forces that have modified, from time to time, the institutions of the Puritan commonwealth. The corporate origin of the colonial government is mentioned; but its significance in the development of colonial institutions is ignored. Even the name "General Court" is ascribed to "the fact that originally the body heard judicial questions" (p. 71). It is misleading to state that "The Provincial Governor . . . could prorogue and dissolve the General Court without being limited by triennial or septennial acts" (p. 15), since the new General Court had to be elected and convened annually; but Mr. Frothingham is quite right in pointing out the indebtedness of the state constitution to the province charter.

S. E. M.

*Annapolis: its Colonial and Naval Story.* By Walter B. Norris. (New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1925, pp. xiv, 323, \$3.00.) The history of Annapolis is a picturesque rather than a significant history. In her origin, indeed, Annapolis represented the contest of Protestant settlers against a Catholic proprietor, but from the close of the seventeenth century her connection with the issues of national life has been due mainly to fortuitous circumstances which have thrown her for fleeting periods into the spotlight. Significance—political, economic, social in the larger sense—she lost two hundred years ago and has never regained. Yet she has always had a picturesque life. She had her prominent families, both Patriot and Loyalist. She was the home of three signers of the Declaration of Independence. She entertained Washington, not once but many times, and Lafayette and Rochambeau as well. The houses where they were wine and dined still stand in considerable numbers, and, as Mr. Norris points out, ancient customs like formal calls and genteel tea-drinking still hold sway.

How should one write the history of such a city? The seven (or is it seventeen?) social sciences—allies of the "new history"—have little to say of her. Perhaps she is a theme for the painter rather than the historian. Indeed, a truly charming part of this book consists in the four drawings by Vernon Howe Bailey and the seven etchings by E. P. Metour. For the rest, Mr. Norris does what is perhaps the only thing possible—tells an anecdotal story, with considerable success in conveying the quaint charm of colonial Annapolis. In style, the first chapter is excellent; those that follow, very uneven. The substance becomes thinner as the narrative progresses, until the last chapter, covering sixty years, trails off into a discussion of hazing at the Naval Academy and an account of the discovery and final entombment of the putative earthly remains of Paul Jones. There is not much to write of Annapolis in those sixty years, but perhaps other sides of Naval Academy life—its educational methods and ideals, for example—might be more worthy of treatment than the pros and cons of hazing.



For the earlier part of his book Mr. Norris has made use of a wide variety of sources. His synthesis from them is of varying quality.

JULIUS W. PRATT.

*Cases on Equitable Relief against Torts.* By Zechariah Chafee, jr., Professor of Law in Harvard University. (Cambridge, Mass., the Editor, 1924, pp. viii, 522, \$4.50.) This collection of cases is based on that portion of Ames's *Cases in Equity Jurisdiction* which came under the heading of Specific Reparation and Prevention of Torts. It differs from the earlier collection chiefly in three respects, namely, the method of arrangement, the lack of stress upon historical material as such, and the emphasis placed upon present-day authorities. Professor Ames chose to group his cases with reference to the particular kind of tort under consideration, whereas Professor Chafee has made a classification which has in view primarily the equitable problem involved without regard to the specific tort. In his case-books, as in his writings, Professor Ames seemed to be influenced by the principle expressed by Baudouin, *sine historia caecam esse jurisprudentiam*; his collections abounded in cases which judged by any standard were old, yet apparently he did not consider as too ancient any case which showed clearly the historical development of either legal principles or procedure. Cases of this historical type Professor Chafee has seen fit practically to dispense with, though some historical matter is to be found in his notes and foot-notes. The question whether or not this general omission of cases dealing with the historical aspect of the subject is altogether expedient, is one which will receive no unanimous answer even from law teachers. There can be no doubt, however, as to the value of the book as a collection of well-chosen modern cases, which is clearly what the editor intended it should be, something over four-fifths of the cases going no further back than 1860, and nearly half of that number being cases tried since the beginning of the present century. For reasons stated in the preface, cases on Equitable Relief against Defamation and Injuries to Personality have been omitted.

G. E. W.

## COMMUNICATIONS

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 4, 1926.

*The Editor of the American Historical Review:*

Dear Sir: In my review of *The Geographical Conceptions of Columbus* by George E. Nunn, published in the *American Historical Review* of April, 1925, I undertook to correct the length, "111,121 meters", given for a mean meridional degree, making it 111,321 meters. To my mortification, it has been pointed out to me that my figures are wrong and Mr. Nunn's right. I hope you have room in your pages for these few words of correction, coupled with my humble apologies to the author of this admirable work.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN BIGELOW.

*The Editor of the American Historical Review:*

Sir: I trust that you will admit some comment on the review of *The Agrarian Movement in North Dakota* which appeared in your pages last January.

Though I admit that I hold no brief for the tenets of the Non-Partisan League, as far as they concern themselves with the development of state-owned industries, I was much surprised to find in your review the statement that the text was "replete with the epithet socialism". I was surprised, the more so, since I had endeavored to concern myself entirely with the development of co-operative enterprise and the relation of the Non-Partisan League to it. This ought to have been made evident by the following, "Concerning the socialistic connections and tendencies of the movement (the Non-Partisan League) we shall not concern ourselves" (p. 96). It is true that the noun socialism or its derivatives are used. The fact must not be overlooked that the Non-Partisan League developed out of the Socialist Party and therefore gives rise to the use of that term to a greater extent than would otherwise be necessary in dealing with the development of co-operative movements. Yet the adjective "socialistic" is used but twice, once on page 96 as quoted above, and again on page 129 as follows:

"If these facts have been well learned, and it seems that they have, the co-operative can go on its way no longer hampered by the *socialistic* idea that in state ownership lies the solution of the marketing problem."

The term "socialist" as applied to the political party of that name, is used six times (pp. 95, 96, 97, foot-note 3, 125, and 129, foot-note 42). The noun socialism is used three times and then only in connection with the Socialist Party (pp. 95, 128, and 129, foot-note 42). Thus the term socialism and some of its derivatives are used but eleven times in the

(598)

course of a discussion dealing entirely with the Non-Partisan League and covering 35 octavo pages. There is no mention of the term in any other part of the text.

Concerning the statement that the data upon which the chapter on the Non-Partisan League is based are "enlivened by reminiscence of forceful vituperation from old columns of the *Bismarck Tribune* or the *Grand Forks Herald*" I would like to make the observation that, although the use of newspapers as sources is perfectly legitimate, I have used those two papers but twice in the treatment of the Non-Partisan League, once by a reference (p. 110, foot-note 24) to the *Bismarck Tribune* (this paper prides itself upon the accuracy of its news) and once to the *Grand Forks Herald* (p. 122, foot-note 36), where I quote Mr. A. C. Townley as follows, "We've got to have a Supreme Court that will hold constitutional the laws we pass in the Legislature".

In the entire text, covering 183 octavo pages, there are only thirteen references to newspaper items, one of which is to the *Grand Forks Herald* and four to the *Bismarck Tribune*.

PAUL ROBERT FOSSUM.

MIDDLETOWN, CONN.

*To the Editor of the American Historical Review:*

IN the above rejoinder to my review of his *Agrarian Movement*, Dr. Fossum ascribes to me a statement that his "text" is "replete with the epithet socialism". But "replete" is a word I never use and did not use in that article. And in what I did say about Dr. Fossum's use of the epithet, I referred not to his text in general but to one topic in it.

These are minor inaccuracies. More important is the assumption (repeated here as a "fact") "that the Non-Partisan League developed out of the Socialist Party". In the book this charge was expanded at some length—in spite of the remarkable disclaimer, "Concerning the socialistic connections and tendencies of the movement we shall not concern ourselves". Now Arthur Townley (whose name, by the way, is not found in Dr. Fossum's index) had formerly been connected with the Socialist Party, and he did afterward draw some of his lieutenants from his old associates there—because he knew their ability as speakers and organizers. But none of these men were silly enough to preach socialism to the individualistic farmers, even if they still believed in it themselves. If the charge is not misleading, it is meaningless.

WILLIS MASON WEST.

MINNEAPOLIS,

March 6, 1926.

## HISTORICAL NEWS

The manuscript of the *General Index* to vols. XXI.-XXX. of this journal is in the printer's hands. It is hoped that publication may be effected in May.

### AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Independent Offices Appropriation Act, passed by Congress in late March, includes the usual appropriation of \$7000 for the printing at the Government Printing Office of the *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association. The *Annual Report* for 1921 is all in page-proof, that for 1922 all in galley-proof.

The Conference of Historical Societies, through a committee of which Dr. Joseph Schafer is chairman, has brought out, as a small book of 81 pages, a *Handbook of American Historical Societies*, which presents data as to organization, support, membership, meetings, libraries, and publications of some three hundred such societies, and will be found useful to many historical workers. Orders for copies, at the price of \$1, should be sent with remittance to the office of the treasurer of the Association, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

The report of the Committee on the Writing of History, prepared jointly by Monsieur Jusserand, Dr. Charles W. Colby, Professor W. C. Abbott, and Professor Bassett, is in the press, and is expected to be published, by Messrs. Scribner's Sons, this spring in a small volume, which should command the immediate attention of graduate students in history, and others.

For the next annual meeting, to be held at Rochester, December 28-30, 1926, the chairman of the Programme Committee, Professor Laurence B. Packard, proposes tentatively the following outline; correspondence from members interested in any part of it is invited.

*Tuesday, December 28.* 10 A.M., group meetings: joint meeting with the Agricultural History Society; Ancient History. 12:30 P.M., luncheon conference, Far East. 2:30 P.M., general meeting, The Meaning of History. 6 P.M., dinners—open dates. 8:15 P.M., general meeting, Presidential Address.

*Wednesday, December 29.* 10 A.M., group meetings: joint meeting with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association; Medieval History. 12:30 P.M., luncheon conference, The Endowment. 2:30 P.M., annual business meeting of the Association. 6:30 P.M., dinners, Medieval. 8:15 P.M., general meeting, Influence of European Civilization in America. 9:30 P.M., smoker.

*Thursday, December 30.* 10 A.M., group meetings: joint meeting with the History of Science Society; Modern History, The Near East.

(600)

12:30 P.M., luncheon conference, Modern European History. 3:30 P.M., debate or round table, Could American Independence Have Been Won without French Assistance? 6:30 P.M., dinners—open dates. 8:15 P.M., general meeting, Modern European History.

The American Council of Learned Societies held its annual meeting in New York on January 23. The American Historical Association was represented by its two delegates, Messrs. Charles H. Haskins, chairman of the Council, and J. F. Jameson; the American Antiquarian Society by Messrs. W. G. Leland, executive secretary of the Council, and C. S. Brigham. The annual conference of the secretaries of the constituent humanistic societies was held on the preceding day. Reports of various committees were read and discussed; among them, reports from the American committees of international co-operation toward a dictionary of (earlier) medieval Latin and a dictionary of late British medieval Latin, from the committee on a catalogue of foreign manuscripts in American libraries, and from the committee of management of the *Dictionary of American Biography*. Arrangements were reported for the survey of research in the United States in the humanistic and social sciences, for which the Carnegie Corporation has made a grant of \$10,000, and which is to be conducted by Professor Frederic A. Ogg, secretary of the American Political Science Association, with office in Washington; for the system of small grants to aid mature scholars in their researches, made possible by a grant of \$5000 from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, and described in our last number (p. 375); and for the *Handbook of Learned and Scientific Societies*, in the preparation of which the Council will co-operate with the National Research Council. Professor Haskins declining re-election to the chairmanship of the Council, Professor Joseph P. Chamberlain of Columbia University was elected chairman for 1926, Professor Walter F. Willcox of Cornell University vice-chairman, Professor Edward C. Armstrong of Princeton secretary and treasurer; the executive committee is to consist of these three, Professor Haskins, and Professor Ralph V. D. Magoffin of New York University. Mr. Leland was chosen as delegate to the annual meeting in May, at Brussels, of the International Union of Academies. He will also represent the United States in the International Committee of Historical Sciences.

At the beginning of February, Professor Allen Johnson began full-time work as editor-in-chief of the *Dictionary of American Biography*, which is to be prepared under the auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies. The office of the enterprise is established in Washington, its address being 602 Hill Building. Professor Johnson has secured the aid of Dr. Harris E. Starr and Mr. F. W. Cochran as assistant editors.

#### THE ENDOWMENT FUND

The Committee on Endowment, having decided to postpone the active canvass until after the 1925 meeting of the Association, devoted the fall

of 1925 to completing the organization of the National Advisory Committee composed of about 130 men of prominence in the various walks of life and in different sections of the country. With very few exceptions the men and women invited gave their indorsement to the project by accepting membership in the committee and many of them expressed enthusiastic approval. The committee also prepared and had printed an eight-page pamphlet containing a concise statement of the nature and functions of the Association and of the reasons for the endowment campaign. Copies of this pamphlet were sent to all members of the National Advisory Committee and were distributed to those in attendance at the Ann Arbor meeting.

The new Committee on Endowment for 1926 includes all the members of the old committee and some others, with former Senator Albert J. Beveridge as chairman and Professor Solon J. Buck as executive secretary. Mr. Buck, having secured leave of absence from the Minnesota Historical Society and the University of Minnesota, arrived in New York on February 3 to devote his full time to the campaign, and headquarters were at once established in Room 110 of the Library Building at Columbia University, where space was generously allotted for the purpose by the authorities of that institution. A meeting of the executive committee of the Committee on Endowment held on February 6 was attended by seven members including the president, the secretary, and the treasurer of the Association. At this meeting, Professor Evarts B. Greene was elected vice-chairman of the committee and the objective of the campaign was fixed as an endowment of a million dollars for the Association.

Most of the work accomplished at the present writing has been of a preliminary nature, such as the compilation of lists and the making of arrangements for publicity. Two local committees have been set up, however, one for Chicago and vicinity with Dr. Otto L. Schmidt as chairman and one for Columbia University under Professor Austin Evans, and it is expected that the canvass at Columbia will be begun in the near future. The pamphlet prepared by the old committee, with slight revisions, will soon be reprinted for distribution to the members, and arrangements have been made for the preparation of another and briefer pamphlet for general distribution. The committee plans to call on the various local chairmen appointed in the spring of 1925 and to appoint additional chairmen to organize committees for the campaign in their communities, and hopes to enlist the active co-operation of a large share of the membership for this movement "in the interest of American history and of history in America"—to quote from the charter of the Association.

#### PERSONAL

Rev. Dr. Henry S. Burrage, state historian of Maine since 1907, died March 9, at the age of eighty-nine. His official volumes on *Maine at Louisburg in 1745* (1910), *The Beginnings of Colonial Maine* (1914), *Maine in the Northeastern Boundary Controversy* (1919), and *Gorges and*



the *Grant of the Province of Maine* (1923), have been much esteemed. He also wrote several volumes of Baptist history.

Dr. Bernard C. Steiner, librarian of the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore, died on January 12, aged fifty-eight. From 1894 to 1911 he was associate in history in the Johns Hopkins University. He wrote biographies of Sir Robert Eden, Dr. James McHenry, Reverdy Johnson, Henry Barnard, and Chief-Justice Taney, and since 1915 had been editor of the *Maryland Archives* for the Maryland Historical Society. He was a friendly, active-minded, and public-spirited scholar.

Sir Paul Vinogradoff, F.B.A., Corpus professor of jurisprudence in the University of Oxford, died on December 19, at the age of seventy-one. Russian by birth, he was for many years a professor of history in the University of Moscow, but in 1902 he removed to England, and in 1903 was elected to the chair named. His strong interest in the medieval history of England had already been shown by his *Villeinage in England* (1892), which was followed in 1905 by *The Growth of the Manor*. He was unwearied in labors as an editor, especially of the *Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History*. What may however be regarded as the great work of his life was the unfinished *Outlines of Historical Jurisprudence* (vol. I., 1920; vol. II., 1922). As we write these lines there comes to the desk what must be his last publication, *Custom and Right* (Oslo, Aschehoug; Oxford University Press), a small book containing four lectures delivered before a Norwegian institute at Oslo.

Sir Sidney Lee, F.B.A., the noted Shakespearean scholar and professor in the University of London, died on March 3, at the age of sixty-six. In the first year of work upon the *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1883, he became assistant to its editor, Sir Leslie Stephen; he was joint editor with the latter in 1890 and 1891; and from 1891 to the completion of the work he was its editor-in-chief, bringing out in that capacity 37 of its 63 volumes, and six volumes of supplements. His valuable biography of Queen Victoria, contributed to the first supplement, was published as a separate book in 1902. His latest years were spent, at the request of King George, in preparing the important book entitled *Edward VII.: a Biography*, of which the first volume was published in 1925. The second, completing the work, is understood to have been practically finished at the time of his death.

Félix Rocquain, for many years an official of the Archives Nationales in Paris, died November 6, at the age of ninety-two. In 1878 he published a work which had much vogue on *L'Esprit Révolutionnaire avant la Révolution*; his later books, however, were in an earlier field: *La Cour de Rome et l'Esprit de Réforme avant Luther* (three vols., 1893-1897) and *La France et Rome pendant les Guerres de Religion* (1924).

Pierre Imbart de la Tour, formerly professor in the University of Bordeaux and author of highly esteemed works on *Les Origines Religieuses de la France: les Paroisses Rurales* (1900) and on *Les Origines de*

*la Réforme* (three vols., 1905-1910), died on December 18, at the age of sixty-five.

Professor William B. Munro has been appointed the first incumbent of the recently established Jonathan Trumbull professorship of American history and government in Harvard University. Professors George H. Blakeslee of Clark University and Verner W. Crane of Brown are lecturers in Harvard University during the second part of the present academic year.

Among the substantial grants from the Milton Fund, for researches by Harvard professors, recently announced, we notice grants to Professor C. H. Haskins, for the preparation of a volume of *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Culture*; to Professor Kirsopp Lake, for the photographing of manuscripts preserved on Mount Athos and on Patmos; to Professor George LaPiana, for the gathering of archaeological evidence respecting the early Roman Church; to Professor A. P. Usher, for researches in Spanish archives on the Spanish aspects of the revolution of prices in the sixteenth century; and to Professor S. E. Morison, for aid in the preparation of an extended history of Harvard University (four volumes are spoken of) by which it is proposed to commemorate in 1936 the three-hundredth anniversary of its founding.

Professor Charles M. Knapp, formerly of the Michigan State Normal School at Kalamazoo, is now professor of history in St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y.

The mention in our January issue that Dr. C. C. Regier had been made head of the historical department at Albion College, Michigan, was incorrect. Dr. Regier has been appointed professor of history in Evansville College (Indiana).

Dr. Gustav Krüger, professor of church history in the University of Giessen, lectures in the University of Chicago during the spring term. Dr. Archibald Main, professor of ecclesiastical history in the University of Glasgow, lectures at Chicago during the first half of the summer session.

Professor Alexander Vasiliev, who has been on a temporary appointment at the University of Wisconsin for the year 1925-1926, will unfortunately not be in a position to give the courses announced in his name for the summer session of 1926. He will, however, return for the fall term of 1926 to take up his permanent residence as professor of history in the University of Wisconsin. His place in the Wisconsin summer session will be taken by Professor Raymond D. Harriman of the University of Utah.

Professor Fred A. Shannon of Iowa State Teachers' College has been appointed associate professor of history in the Kansas State Agricultural College for the academic year 1926-1927.

Professor Percy S. Flippin of Mercer University has been engaged to teach this year in the summer school of Johns Hopkins University. Professor Arthur C. Cole of the Ohio State University will teach during the approaching summer session in the University of Michigan, Professor Edgar H. McNeal in Columbia University, and Professor Carl Wittke in the University of Chicago. Professor Clarence E. Carter, of Miami University, will give courses in the Ohio State University during the summer quarter. Professor Lester B. Shippee, of the University of Minnesota, will teach in the University of Iowa during the first term of the next summer quarter, and Professors William T. Morgan, of Indiana University, and Thad W. Riker, of the University of Texas, in the second term.

#### GENERAL

A gift of a million dollars from the trustees of the estate of the late John W. Sterling has enabled the Graduate School of Yale University to establish the Sterling Fellowships for research in the humanistic studies and the natural sciences. They are open equally to graduates of Yale University and of other approved colleges and universities, American or foreign, to both men and women, graduate students or instructors or professors on leave of absence, who desire to carry on studies and investigations under the direction of the graduate faculty of Yale University or in affiliation with that body. These fellowships are divided into two general classes, research or senior fellowships, for which the Ph.D. degree is requisite, or such training and experience in research as are indicated by that degree, and junior fellowships. The stipends are liberal; the recipients are not to engage in teaching during the tenure of appointment. Applications for the senior fellowships should be addressed to the dean of the school before April 1, for the junior fellowships before March 1, in any given year.

The Yale University Press has brought out a volume by Professor Frederick J. Teggart entitled *The Theory of History*, in which he sets forth the difficulties under which the social sciences are struggling and offers a method for the solution of the problem.

A large committee of the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters (of English schools) prepared during the years 1923-1925 a *Memorandum on the Teaching of History*, which has been published this spring by the Cambridge University Press, and which, despite the differences between English and American school systems, may be of much use to American teachers.

A new (fifth) edition of the *Historians' History of the World* (27 volumes) is announced by the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York.

The Macmillan Company is publishing a new *Outline of History*, by H. G. Wells, which is to appear periodically in twenty-four parts. It

is stated that Mr. Wells has "recast the material of the old *Outline of History*, rewritten many parts, and added much new matter", aiming to make the new work complete and up to date and "simpler and easier to read". The work includes more than eight hundred illustrations.

Professor Frank W. Blackmar of the University of Kansas has brought out through Scribner a *History of Human Society*.

*Die Weltgeschichte und ihr Rhythmus* (Munich, Reinhardt, 1925, pp. xii, 391) has for author Friedrich Cornelius, the grandson of C. A. Cornelius.

Students of economic history will be interested alike in the rapid survey of the relations of capital and labor from antiquity to the present, *Capitale e Lavoro, Disegno Storico*, by the well-known scholar Corrado Barbagallo (Milan, Nogare, 1925, pp. xxviii, 158), and in the careful monographs on *Les Industries Textiles* by Paul de Rousiers (Paris, Colin, 1925, pp. 261), and on *Les Industries de la Soie en France* by Pierre Clerget (*ibid.*, 1925, pp. 196) in the series *Les Grandes Industries Modernes*.

The February number of the *Historical Outlook* contains, besides an account of the Ann Arbor meeting of the American Historical Association, an article on the Security Pact of the Locarno Conference, by Professor V. K. Sugareff of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. The March number has an article by Professor F. H. Hodder on the Court and the League.

The *Catholic Historical Review* for January contains a survey of the Historiography of American Catholic History, by Rev. Adrian T. English, O.P.; a paper on the Renaissance and Modern Europe, by Maurice Wilkinson, of St. John's College, Oxford; a brief paper by Rev. Charles L. Souvay, C.M., discussing the question whether the twelve "anathematisms" of St. Cyril were read and approved at the Council of Ephesus; and a discussion of the earliest life of St. Columba, by James F. Kenney of the Public Archives of Canada.

The January number of the *Journal of Negro History* presents three addresses read last autumn at the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History: an address on What the Negro Church has Done, by R. A. Carter; one on the Contribution of the Negro to the Religious Life of America, by L. W. Kyles of Winston-Salem, N. C.; and one by Professor William T. Laprade of Duke University, on the Domestic Slave Trade in the District of Columbia. There is also an article, by Professor N. A. N. Cleven of Pittsburgh, on Some Plans of the Civil War Period for Colonizing Liberated Negro Slaves in Hispanic America. Professor Waldemar Westergaard, of the University of California, Southern Branch, presents, from the Danish archives, an account of the Negro Rebellion of 1759 on the Island of St. Croix. The main element in the number however (150

pp.) is a body of personal or private letters of negroes, derived from various sources, but especially from the archives of the American Colonization Society—very miscellaneous, yet curious and illuminating material on conditions of slavery.

Longmans, Green, and Company have published a volume by Professor William C. Morey, entitled *Diplomatic Episodes: a Review of Certain Historical Incidents bearing upon International Relations and Diplomacy*. The work begins with a chapter on Our First Diplomatic Controversy: a Prelude to the Jay Treaty, and closes with chapters on the Growth of the Concert of Europe, and the Historical Development of Peace.

Vol. II. of H. Pinard de la Boullaye's *Étude Comparée des Religions* is devoted to a critique of methods and is said to contain a mine of information for those interested in this field (Paris, Beauchesne, 1925, pp. xi, 523).

He who would master the art of deciphering messages written in secret codes will find an introduction to this fascinating study by André Lange and E. A. Soudart, entitled *Traité de Cryptographie* (Paris, Alcan, 1925, pp. 380).

*The Evolution of Anatomy*, from the early Greeks to Harvey's demonstration of the circulation of the blood, is admirably treated in an illustrated volume by Dr. Charles Singer (London, Kegan Paul).

The Library Association of the United Kingdom has published in a quarto volume of 200 pages that portion of its *Subject Index to Periodicals, 1922*, which relates to the historical, political, and economic sciences.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. G. Heinberg, *History of the Majority Principle* (American Political Science Review, February); Bernard Schmeidler, *Zur Psychologie des Historikers und zur Lage der Historie in der Gegenwart*, I., II. (Preussische Jahrbücher, November, December); Friedrich Meyer, *Ueber Kants Stellung zu Nation und Staat* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXIII. 2).

#### ANCIENT HISTORY

C. E. Vulliamy's *Our Prehistoric Forerunners* (London, Lane, 1925, pp. ix, 214) is spoken of as one of the best manuals of recent times in this field.

The last section of the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXV. 3-4, is devoted to a bibliography of recently published works on ancient history, running to about a hundred pages.

The Cambridge University Press has nearly ready for publication the fourth volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, of which the subtitle is *The Persian War and the West*. Most of the chapters relate to the Persian Empire and Athens, culminating in the Persian War; but there

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—40.

are also chapters on Carthage and Sicily, Italy in the Etruscan age, and coinage from its origin to the Persian War. The volume described in our last number (p. 378) as the fourth was the third. Vol. IV. will soon be followed by a volume of plates to illustrate these first four volumes; it is being prepared by Mr. C. T. Seltman.

The first volume of the *Essai de Synthèse de l'Histoire de l'Humanité* by Professor N. Jorga of Bucharest is devoted to *Histoire Ancienne* (Paris, Gamber, 1926, pp. 400).

A new volume on *Ancient Egypt* (London, Williams and Norgate), by Sir W. M. Flinders Petrie, who undertook the work at the request of Herbert Spencer's trustees, has been published as an addition to Spencer's collection on *Descriptive Sociology*.

The fourth *Lieferung* of the Kromayer-Veith *Schlachten-Atlas zur Antiken Kriegsgeschichte* (Leipzig, Wagner and Debes) contains five sheets, 43 maps, beautifully executed, illustrating the Grecian wars from Marathon to Chaeronea, and accompanied by explanatory text. All is worked out with the most careful scholarship. In September last, Colonel Veith, while studying in Asia Minor the campaign of Caesar against Pharnaces, was murdered by two beggars. His place in the work has been taken by Lieut.-Col. E. Nischer von Falkenhof, chief of the cartographical section in the war archives at Vienna. Two more parts will complete the atlas.

Vol. I. of the second part of the *Histoire Générale* edited by Gustave Glotz is now ready. It covers, as already announced, the *Histoire de la Grèce, des Origines aux Guerres Médiques*, and is by M. Glotz with the collaboration of R. Cohen (Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1926, pp. xxii, 636).

An ingenious effort to explain the circumstances leading to the specific city-types represented by the Sparta of Lycurgus and the Athens of Cleisthenes is made by Viktor Ehrenberg in *Neugründer des Staates, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Spertas und Athens im 6. Jahrhundert* (Munich, Beck, 1925, pp. ix, 134).

In *Le Théâtre Grec; l'Édifice, l'Organisation Matérielle, les Représentations* (Paris, Payot, 1925, pp. 280), Octave Navarre, the Hellenist peculiarly competent in this specialty, has completely revised his *Dionysos* of 1895.

The second part of the late Ernest Babelon's *Traité des Monnaies Grecques et Romaines* is devoted to a *Description Historique*. Of this, the fourth volume is concerned with the coins of northern Greece in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. It will be complete in three fascicles; the first of these has now appeared (Paris, Leroux, 1926, pp. 223).

The *Annals of Quintus Ennius*, edited with English notes for the first time, have been brought out by the Cambridge University Press (pp. xii, 246), the editing being by Dr. Ethel Mary Steuart, lecturer in Latin in the University of Edinburgh.



The Schweich Lectures for 1924, *The Samaritans: their History, Doctrines, and Literature*, by Dr. Moses Gaster, has been published for the British Academy (London, Humphrey Milford).

Professor J. J. Van Nostrand, of the University of California, has published a monograph on the *Imperial Domains of Africa Proconsularis* (University of California Publications in History, pp. 88) based on studies of the inscription of Henschir Mettich which exhibits the general terms of the Lex Manciana, and on inscriptions more local in scope; it endeavors to show the mode of dealing with public lands and coloni as arranged by Augustus and especially by Vespasian.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. A. Heidel, *The Calendar of Ancient Israel* (Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, December); Werner Schur, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Ptolemäerreiches* (Klio, XX. 3); W. L. Westermann, *The Greek Exploitation of Egypt* (Political Science Quarterly, December); Ellis Hesselmeier, *Decumates Agri und Agri Decumani* (Klio, XX. 3).

#### EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

The *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres* which Professor Ernst Diehl of Innsbruck is editing will consist of two volumes. The first (Berlin, Weidmann, pp. xiii, 488), including especially the inscriptions respecting the martyrs, has been published.

The learned volume by M. Chaîne on *La Chronologie des Temps Chrétiens de l'Égypte et de l'Éthiopie* (Paris, Geuthner, 1925, pp. xvi, 344) contains, beside a history and concordance of the Julian, Gregorian, Coptic, and Mohammedan calendars, chronological tables and lists of important personages in this area from Roman times to the present.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Delehaye, *Les Recueils Antiques de Miracles des Saints*, II. (Analecta Bollandiana, XLIII. 3-4).

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY

A national organization devoted to the study of all aspects of medieval life was incorporated in December as the Mediaeval Academy of America. Its intention is to stimulate further researches and more extensive publication in the medieval field, to serve as a co-ordinating bureau for all activities in America concerning the life and thought of the Middle Ages, and to foster international co-operation in the same field. All persons interested in any aspect of medieval life are eligible to active membership. The Clerk of the Academy, to whom inquiries may be addressed, is Mr. Ralph Adams Cram, 248 Boylston Street, Boston. The organ of the Academy is a quarterly, *Speculum, a Journal of Mediaeval Studies*, whose advent we welcome with great cordiality. Its field will include the history of the Middle Ages, their philosophy, science, and arts, their Latin language and literature. The first number of this journal, dated January,

presents the valuable paper on the Spread of Ideas in the Middle Ages read by Professor Charles H. Haskins before the American Historical Association at the Richmond meeting, a discussion of the Progenitors of Goliath, by Professor James H. Hanford of the University of Michigan, a discussion of new views as to the Home of the Easter Play, by Professor Karl Young of Yale University, other papers relating more to medieval literature than to history, and excellent reviews. At the end, the new journal presents a code of general suggestions to contributors, concerning the presentation of bibliographical details and other matters of typography. Most of these suggestions we should be glad to have our own contributors observe, but we do not venture to hope for it. We should be delighted if only they would double-space their foot-notes as well as their texts. This initial number of *Speculum* is of high quality and of admirable appearance.

The Oxford University Press is publishing a treatise on medieval chronology and methods of reckoning time, by Dr. Reginald L. Poole, entitled *Chronicles and Annals*.

The well-known *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des Römischen Katholizismus* by Karl Mirbt has received a fourth edition (the third appeared in 1911), with substantial additions, especially in the more recent period (Tübingen, Mohr, 1925, pp. xxxii, 650).

In the *Home University Library* appears a model little book by Mr. Norman H. Baynes on the *Byzantine Empire*, treating of historical, ecclesiastical, social, economic, and literary history, and accompanied by a good bibliography.

Pandulph's continuation of the *Liber Pontificalis* has hitherto been known only through a Vatican manuscript (and its derivatives) written in 1142 by a scribe who was hostile to the party which Pandulph had upheld and who therefore altered his narrative. Lately however Father Joseph March, professor in the Jesuit College at Sarriá, near Barcelona, had the good fortune to discover, in the capitular library of Tortosa, a twelfth-century manuscript which gives Pandulph's actual text, having therefore especial value for the four papal reigns from Paschal II. to Honorius II., with whose death in 1130 it ends. This Father March publishes, *Liber Pontificalis prout exstat in Codice Manuscripto Dertusensi* (Barcelona, 1925; Paris, G. Beauchesne).

The tenth volume of *The Lives of the Popes of the Middle Ages*, the learned work of Right Rev. Monsignor Horace K. Mann, was published in 1914. Vol. XIII. has now appeared (London, Kegan Paul), covering the reigns of Honorius III., Gregory IX., and Celestine IV. (1216-1241).

Professor Maurice De Wolf's *History of Mediaeval Philosophy* is well known from the edition of 1909, a translation of the second French edition. Professor De Wolf has since recast the work and divided it into two volumes, and a new translation has been made from the fifth French edition. Vol. I. is in the press of Messrs. Longmans.

Two publications of importance are the seventh and ninth fascicles of the *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense*, devoted respectively to a study by Edgar Hocedez of *Richard de Middleton, sa Vie, ses Oeuvres, sa Doctrine* (Paris, Champion, 1926, pp. 552) and to the second volume of *La Réforme Grégorienne* by Augustin Fliche, dealing specifically with Gregory VII. (*ibid.*, pp. 460).

Dr. Johann Loserth, whose *Hus und Wiclif* has maintained a high position of authority ever since its publication in 1884, has published a second edition of that important book (Munich, Oldenbourg), enriched with all the labor which he and others have bestowed upon the subject during the more than forty years intervening.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: N. H. Baynes, *Byzantine Civilisation* (History, January); Caroline Skeel, *Medieval Wills* (*ibid.*); B. W. Wheeler, *The Papacy and Hispanic Interstate Relations, 1195-1212* (Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters, 1925); Gaston Guillard, *Les Étudiants et la Crise du Logement au Moyen Age* (Mercure de France, January 15).

#### MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Professor C. P. Higby, of the University of North Carolina, is planning to prepare and issue each year a bulletin concerning the progress in the United States of studies in modern European history similar to Professor J. F. Willard's very useful bulletin of the progress of medieval studies. The University of North Carolina will meet the costs of its publication. Professor Higby will be glad to receive communications from any workers in the field indicated, who may have data to supply concerning researches in progress or publications contemplated. Address, Chapel Hill, N. C.

*An Outline of Modern European History* (New York, Doubleday, Page and Company, pp. 138), by Professor Halford L. Hoskins, of Tufts College, is a syllabus of references and bibliographies, made chiefly to show the lines of development of human institutions.

Among recent advance-publications from the *Proceedings* of the British Academy (Oxford University Press) we note a learned and suggestive lecture, on the Henriette Hertz foundation, by Mr. P. S. Allen, on *Erasmus' Services to Learning*.

The Harvard University Press has published a small volume by Dr. George P. Winship entitled *Gutenberg to Plantin: an Outline of the Early History of Printing*.

Kurt Dietrich Schmidt's *Studien zur Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, vol. II. (Tübingen, Paul Siebeck, 1925, pp. 220), is occupied with the first period only of the Council's history, down to the migration to Bologna, and considers chiefly two matters: the skillful activity of the papal legates in opposition to most of the bishops, and the actions of the Council respecting the sources of church doctrine.

*Die Politik des Kurfürsten Josef Clemens von Köln bei Ausbruch des Spanischen Erbfolgekrieges und die Vertreibung der Franzosen vom Niederrhein, 1701-1703*, by Max Braubach (Bonn, Schroeder, 1925, pp. 240), is based on mostly unused documents from the Munich and Düsseldorf archives.

A further contribution to the Bazaine problem is made by Edmond Bapst's *Le Siège de Metz en 1870, d'après les Notes Manuscrites laissées par Germain Bapst* (Paris, Lahure, 1926, pp. 560).

Dr. Otto Becker of Berlin has published a careful study of the system of secret alliances, based on the new publications from the German archives, and entitled *Bismarck und die Einkreisung Deutschlands* (Berlin, Carl Heymann). The first volume, *Bismarck's Bündnispolitik*, appeared in 1923; the second, *Das Französisch-Russische Bündnis* (1925), is soon to be followed by a third, *Die Triple-Entente*.

Dr. Herbert W. Briggs, instructor in political science in the Johns Hopkins University, in *The Doctrine of Continuous Voyage* (*Johns Hopkins Studies*, series XLIV., no. 2, pp. 226), traces the history of the doctrine, and the decisions expounding it, through the period in which its application was chiefly to colonial instances (*Essex case*, etc.), the period of our Civil War (*Springbok*, etc.), and the whole period of the World War, in which the Allies extended the applications of the doctrine to additional contraband and blockade to such a degree as to threaten large parts of international maritime law.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. M. Jacobs, *The Background of Modern History*, II. *The World Religion and the World State* (*Lutheran Church Review*, January); H. S. Fraser, *A Sketch of the History of International Arbitration* (*Cornell Law Quarterly*, February); Ivan Pusino, *Ficinos und Picos Religiös-Philosophische Anschauungen* (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XLIV. 4); Camille Monnet, *Bayard à la Cour de Savoie* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, January); Hermann Dörries, *Calvin und Lefèvre* (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XLIV. 4); E. A. Beller, *The Mission of Sir Thomas Roe to the Conference at Hamburg, 1638-1640* (*English Historical Review*, January); A. F. Steuart, *Sweden and the Jacobites, 1719-1720* (*Scottish Historical Review*, January); H. A. Wooster, *Manufacturer and Artisan, 1790-1840* (*Journal of Political Economy*, February); Walter Platzhoff, *Die Deutsche und die Dänische Aktenpublikation über Artikel V. des Prager Friedens* (*Archiv für Politik und Geschichte*, December); Carlo Pagani, *Il Conte Luigi Corti al Congresso di Berlino* (*Nuova Antologia*, November 1); Russo-British Relations during the Eastern Crisis: the Conference of Constantinople [Russian documents, in French, 1876-1877] (*Slavonic Review*, December); J. H. Hammond, *The Jameson Raid and the World War* (*Scribner's Magazine*, March); Ange Morre, *La Démocratie Européenne au XX<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, VII.-X. (*Nouvelle Revue*, November 1, 15, January 1, 15).

## THE WORLD WAR

In Professor Shotwell's well-known series of volumes upon the economic and social history of the World War there is expected to appear before long a volume compiled by Waldo G. Leland and Newton D. Mereness, entitled *Introduction to the American Official Sources of the Social and Economic History of the World War*.

Professor R. W. Seton-Watson of the University of London is soon to publish a volume entitled *Serajevo*, treating of the immediate origins of the World War.

Bertrand Auerbach is the author of a volume in the *Bibliothèque d'Histoire Contemporaine*, dealing with *L'Autriche et la Hongrie pendant la Guerre, Août 1914-Novembre 1918* (Paris, Alcan, 1925, pp. xxviii, 628).

A bit of source-material for the better understanding of one phase of the World War may be found in Ludwig Schraudenbach's *Muharebe, der Erlebte Roman eines Deutschen Führers im Osmanischen Heere, 1916-1917* (Munich, Dreimaskenverlag, 1925, pp. 469).

*Reparation und Wiederaufbau*, by H. F. Simon (Berlin, Heymann, 1925, pp. 332), deals chiefly with the history of the reparation question under four divisions, marked respectively by the peace treaty, the London ultimatum, the negotiations at Cannes and Genoa, and the Poincaré period up to the end of 1923.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Wilhelm Marx, *The Responsibility for the War* (Foreign Affairs, January); M. Boghitschewitsch, *Nouvelles Dépôts concernant l'Attentat de Serajevo*, I., II. (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, January, February); Graf Szeccsen, *Ein Vergeblicher Versuch für die Erhaltung des Friedens im Sommer 1914* (*ibid.*, February); *Neue Dokumente zur Julikrise 1914*, I., II. (*ibid.*, January, February); Graf Max Montgelas, *Sasonows Selbstanklage* (*ibid.*, November); A. Weber, *Graf Tisza und die Kriegserklärung an Serbien* (*ibid.*, December); Ernst Otto, *Die Kriegstagebücher im Weltkriege* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, December); Paul Chack, *Batailles Manquées*, I. (Revue de Paris, January 15); Paul Chack, *L'Attaque et la Défense du Canal de Suez, Février, 1915*, I.—concl. (Revue des Deux Mondes, December 15, January 1, 15); Alfred von Tirpitz, *Kriegsdauer und Seestrategie* (Preussische Jahrbücher, January); G. Salvemini, *Italian Diplomacy during the World War* (Foreign Affairs, January); K. Freiherr von Werkmann, *Die Ischler Monarchenbegegnung im Sommer, 1918* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, November); Ch. de la Ménardière, *Les Enlèvements Allemands en France pendant la Guerre de 1914-1918 et les Restitutions*, I. (Revue des Sciences Politiques, October-December).

## GREAT BRITAIN

Vol. VIII. of the fourth series of the *Transactions* of the Royal Historical Society opens with a paper on William IV. of Orange and his

English Marriage, by Professor P. Geyl, presenting the gist of his Dutch book entitled *Willem IV. en Engeland tot 1748*. Miss Frances H. Relf, professor in Wells College, having unearthed additional volumes of notes of debates by Henry Elsing, clerk of the Parliaments, discusses the Debates in the House of Lords in 1628. Then follow papers on the Financial Administration of Henry I., by Geoffrey H. White; on Coal-mining in the Seventeenth Century, by Miss Asta Moller; on Devonshire Ports in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, by Miss Frances A. Mace; on the Beginnings of the Dissolution of Monasteries, in the suppression of the house of Austin canons at Aldgate, called Christ Church, by Miss E. Jeffries Davis; on Experiments in Exchequer Procedure in the period 1200-1232, by Miss Mabel H. Mills; and on the Exchequer Year, by H. G. Richardson. The society expects to be able before long to issue a third volume of *Diplomatic Instructions* (Denmark, 1689-1789), edited by Mr. J. F. Chance.

The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions in Wales and Monmouthshire has published an inventory of those in the county of Pembroke, a sumptuous folio volume, fully illustrated, *Pembrokeshire* (H. M. Stationery Office, pp. lviii, 490).

Mr. Gordon Home has brought together practically all existing information, historical and archaeological, for his account of *Roman London* (London, Ernest Benn), and has enriched the volume with many drawings, maps, and plans.

Mr. Edward Foord's *The Last Age of Roman Britain* (London, Harrap) gives a description of Romano-British resistance to the Anglo-Saxons in the fifth and sixth centuries. He holds that Britain was not lost to the Romans until 440.

The corporation of the City of London has followed Mr. A. H. Thomas's *Calendar of Early Mayor's Court Rolls* with a *Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls, 1323-1864*, edited by the same hand, from the archives preserved at the Guildhall (Cambridge University Press).

The Oxford University Press has published *Revenues of Kings of England, 1066-1399*, elaborated with his habitual thoroughness by the late Sir James Ramsay of Bamff.

In Mr. G. G. Coulton's series of *Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought*, two volumes about to appear are: *Medieval Preaching in England*, by G. R. Owst, and *English Monastic Finances in the Later Middle Ages*, by R. H. Snape.

The Yale University Press announces a volume on *Council and Courts in Anglo-Norman England*, by the late George B. Adams.

The University of Chicago has acquired a collection of several thousand documents—charters, deeds, manor rolls, letters, inventories, receipts, etc.—which for more than three centuries has been preserved at Redgrave



Hall, in Suffolk, being the accumulated documents of the Lord Keeper Bacon and certain of his descendants. They range in date from the thirteenth century down. Meanwhile the Huntington Library, at San Gabriel, has acquired an enormous collection formerly housed at Stowe, the historic seat of the dukes of Buckingham and Chandos, embracing thousands of medieval documents of the Grenville family and others, with a still larger number of later pieces.

A valuable contribution to the history of travel in England and to English social history in general is *The English Inn, Past and Present: a Review of its History and Social Life* (London, Batsford), by A. E. Richardson and H. D. Eberlein.

*Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI.* (Cambridge University Press), by C. H. E. Smyth, is an historical study based upon an essay to which the Thirwall and Gladstone prizes for 1925 were awarded.

Messrs. Longmans announce for early publication an interesting contribution to the history of the English Catholics under Elizabeth, *Life of the Venerable Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel and Surrey*, by Cecil Kerr.

Lord Birkenhead, in *Fourteen English Judges* (London, Cassell), gives vivid examples of critical biography, selecting judges whose work had an important influence on the development of English law, from Bacon and Coke down to Cairns and Halsbury. Lord Birkenhead has also produced a volume of *Famous Trials of History* (London, Hutchinson), including those of Mary Queen of Scots, Colonel Blood, Captain Kidd, Eugene Aram, and Warren Hastings.

Vol. XXV. of the Catholic Record Society is a volume of *Dominicana*, edited chiefly by the Very Rev. Bede Jarrett, O.P., in which, among many documents illustrative of Dominican history in England, especial attention may be called to 82 letters or other pieces of Philip Howard (1629-1694), in religion Brother Thomas, O.P., cardinal of Norfolk.

An Englishman living in Mexico City, Mr. G. R. G. Conway, contributes to the *London Times Literary Supplement* of January 7 a long letter on a certain Don Pedro Zartillon, *alcalde mayor* of Parral, and his years of residence in England, from archives of the Inquisition relative to his examination by the Holy Office, 1662-1663.

D. Appleton and Company have published *The Diary of a Young Lady of Fashion in the Year 1764-1765*, being the chronicle of a young Irish girl's travels in England and on the Continent. The diarist is Cleone Knox, and the diary has been edited by her kinsman, Alexander B. Kerr.

John Cary (1754-1835) was one of the most notable, if not one of the most distinguished, of English cartographers. Sir George Fordham presents a bibliography of his works, with an introduction and biographical notes, in a volume entitled *John Cary, Engraver, Map, Chart, and Print-Seller and Globe-Maker* (Cambridge University Press).

The Yale University Press is publishing a volume on *The Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations, 1748-1782*, by Professor Arthur H. Basye, of Dartmouth College.

Dom Cuthbert Butler, formerly Abbot of Downside, and president of the English Benedictine congregation, has added much to the already copious materials for the history of English Catholicism in the nineteenth century, by two volumes on the *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne, 1806-1889* (London, Burns, Oates, and Company).

A second series of *Letters of Queen Victoria*, in two volumes, 1862-1878, edited by George E. Buckle, has been published by Longmans.

Considerable interest attaches to the group of essays on *Englische Staatsmänner von Pitt bis Asquith und Grey* by Emil Daniels, former co-editor of the *Preussische Jahrbücher* and contributor to the *Cambridge Modern History* (Berlin, Stilke, 1925, pp. 434).

Houghton Mifflin Company has brought out *The Life of W. T. Stead*, in two volumes, by Frederic Whyte.

No. 64 of the Historical Association's pamphlets is *The Scottish Parliament*, by Dr. Robert S. Rait, historiographer royal for Scotland.

The Historical Manuscripts Commission will shortly issue vol. I. of the manuscripts of Lord De L'Isle and Dudley.

Other documentary publications: *Year Books of Edward II.*, vol. XVII., 8 Edward II., A.D. 1314, ed. W. C. Bolland (Selden Society); *Rotuli Ricardi Gravesend, Diocesis Lincolnensis*, pars III. (Canterbury and York Society); *Registrum Roberti Winchelsey, Diocesis Cantuariensis*, pars III. (*id.*); *The Pinchbeck Register* [of St. Edmund's Bury Abbey], ed. Lord Francis Hervey (Oxford University Press).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. E. A. Jolliffe, *Northumbrian Institutions* (English Historical Review, January); H. Sée, *L'Évolution du Capitalisme en Angleterre, du XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle au Commencement du XIX<sup>e</sup>* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, XL.); Percy T. Fenn, jr., *The Latitudinarians and Toleration* (Washington University Studies, Humanistic Ser., October); H. W. C. Davis, *Lancashire Reformers, 1816-1817* (Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, January).

#### IRELAND AND THE DOMINIONS

(For Canada, see p. 641; for India, see p. 627)

*Early Christian Ireland; a Manual of Irish Christian Archaeology*, by the Rev. Father Power, professor of archaeology in University College, Cork (Dublin, Gill, 1925, pp. 113), is an excellent summary of present knowledge, dealing with such matters as ecclesiastical discipline, religious architecture, round towers, Celtic crosses, decorative art, manuscripts, and hagiology.

In the volume *Gleanings from Irish History*, Mr. William F. T. Butler describes with a great deal of care, from original contemporary sources, the leading features of the organization of the Gaelic portions of Ireland at the time when the old Gaelic polity was passing away, and was being replaced by fresh institutions (London, Longmans, pp. xv, 335).

Messrs. Longmans have just issued the fourth volume of Sir George E. Cory's *The Rise of South Africa*, carrying the narrative from 1838 to 1846.

*The Making of Rhodesia* (London, Macmillan), by Lieut.-Col. Hugh Marshall Hole, is a description of its evolution by one who was for twenty-three years a resident in that colony and a servant to the British South Africa Company from its beginning.

In *Missionaries and Annexation in the Pacific* (Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. 101), K. L. P. Martin exhibits the political results of the activity of English missionaries in Polynesia during the nineteenth century; the work is well documented.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Paul Grosjean, S.J., *Patriciana* (Analecta Bollandiana, XLIII. 3-4).

#### FRANCE

General reviews: H. Hauser, *Histoire de France, Époque Moderne, 1494-1661* (Revue Historique, November); G. Weill, *Le Catholicisme Français depuis 1802* [1907-1925] (Revue de Synthèse Historique, XL.).

The *Revue Historique*, in recognition of its fiftieth anniversary, announces certain changes in the arrangement of its contents, the most important of which is the relegation of articles too long for its pages to an occasional separate supplement, entitled *Bibliothèque de la Revue Historique*. The list of books received is hereafter to appear at the end of each number of the *Revue*, in such wise that it may be detached, if so desired, and retained for bibliographical purposes.

*La Mère des Guises* (Champion, 1925, pp. 426), by the late Duc de Pimodan, is an interesting and valuable life of Antoinette de Bourbon, prepared by a descendant, and accompanied by many letters and documents.

The Société de l'Histoire de France has published the sixth volume of the *Mémoires du Cardinal de Richelieu*, being those for the year 1626, edited by Robert Lavollée (Paris, Champion, 1926, pp. 365).

M. Henri Malo, whose previous works on the Dunkirk privateers carried their story to the death of Jean Bart, has now completed it by two volumes on the succeeding periods, *La Grande Guerre des Corsaires: Dunkerque, 1702-1715* (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1925, pp. 259), and *Les Derniers Corsaires: Dunkerque, 1715-1815* (*ibid.*, pp. 292).

There has long been need of such a book as *L'Évolution Commerciale et Industrielle de la France sous l'Ancien Régime* (Paris, Giard, 1925, pp. 396), which few are more competent to treat than the author, M. Henri Sée. Two briefer publications by him in this field, a manual and a volume of essays, have been recently noticed in this journal.

The ninth series of *Mémoires et Documents pour servir à l'Histoire du Commerce et de l'Industrie en France*, edited by Julien Hayem (Paris, Hachette, 1925, pp. vii, 344), is given up, for the most part, to the studies of Henri Sée on the maritime commerce of Brittany in the eighteenth century, based mainly on the papers of a great export and commission house in St. Malo. Another economic study of value is a doctoral dissertation by Albert Le Bail on *L'Agriculture dans un Département Français: le Finistère Agricole* (Angers, Société Française d'Imprimerie, 1925, pp. xii, 339).

To the important volume of essays *Autour de Robespierre*, M. Albert Mathiez of Dijon adds a companion, *Autour de Danton* (Paris, Payot, 1926, pp. 288). The reader may be assured of equal learning, if not of equal sympathy.

A glimpse into the opposition sentiment under the Empire is afforded by Comte de Lort de Sérignan's *Un Conspireur Militaire sous le Premier Empire; le Général Malet* (Paris, Payot, 1925, pp. 333).

Under the title *Vingt-cinq Ans à Paris, 1826-1852*, Ernest Daudet has been publishing the journal of Count Rodolphe Apponyi, attaché of the Austrian embassy at Paris. The fourth and concluding volume extends from 1844 to 1852 (Paris, Plon, 1926, pp. 548).

To the series *Récits d'Autrefois*, a volume has been added on *La Fin Tragique du Maréchal Ney*, by P. Bouchardon (Paris, Hachette, 1925, pp. 123).

The French series of studies in the *Economic and Social History of the World War* has been further enriched by three new volumes: Camille Bloch's *Bibliographie Méthodique de l'Histoire Économique et Sociale de la France pendant la Guerre* (Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1926, pp. xxxvi, 920), Paul Courteault's *La Vie Économique à Bordeaux pendant la Guerre* (*ibid.*, pp. xii, 100), and Pierre Pinot's *Le Contrôle du Ravitaillement de la Population Civile* (*ibid.*, pp. xii, 320).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Pierre Guilloux, *Abélard et le Couvent du Paraclet* (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, July, October); G. Dodu, *La Folie de Charles VI*. (*Revue Historique*, November-December); Felix Liebermann, *Shaw's Bildnis der Jungfrau von Orleans* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXXIII. 1); M. Carreyre, *Le Jansénisme pendant les Premiers Mois de la Régence, Septembre-Décembre, 1715* (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, July, October); Georges Hardy, *Le Cardinal de Fleury et le Mouvement Philosophique* (*Annales Historiques*

de la Révolution Française, November); Georges Lefebvre, *Les Mines de Littry sous l'Ancien Régime et pendant les Premières Années de la Révolution, 1744-1793* (*ibid.*, January); L. Lévy-Schneider, *L'Autonomie Administrative de l'Épiscopat Français à la Fin de l'Ancien Régime* (*Revue Historique*, January); F. Charles-Roux, *Le Projet Français de Commerce avec l'Inde par Suez sous le Règne de Louis XVI.*, concl. (*Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises*, 1925, 4); Capt. E. H. Randle, *Napoleon Bonaparte from 1784 to 1795* (*Infantry Journal*, February); Dom H. Leclercq, *Les Fédérations Provinciales en 1790* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, January); Gustave Laurent, *La Mission des Conventionnels Prieur (de la Marne), Sillery, et Carra après Valmy, 24 Septembre-1 Novembre, 1792* (*Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française*, November); Percy T. Fenn, jr., *Anglo-French Diplomacy in 1792-1793: a Study in the Psychology of Revolution* (*Washington University Studies, Humanistic Ser.*, October); G. Lenotre, *Robespierre et la "Mère de Dieu"*, I., II. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, December 15, January 1); Charles Barbaud, *Murat en Corse, 1815* (*Napoléon*, November); Duc de Morny, *La Genèse d'un Coup d'État; Mémoire du Duc de Morny publié par son Petit-Fils* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, December 1); Auguste Laugel, *M. Thiers et les Princes d'Orléans* (*Revue de Paris*, December 15); Duc de Broglie, *Mémoires*, IX., X. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, November 1, 15).

#### ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

In the *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1925, pp. 168 ff.), E. Sthamer continues his "Studien über die Sizilischen Register Friedrichs II.," begun in the same collection in 1920.

An undertaking of importance, not only for the history of Venice but also for administrative and economic history in general, is the great collection of *Documenti Finanziari della Repubblica di Venezia*, editi dalla Commissione per gli Atti delle Assemblee Costituzionali Italiane (R. Accademia dei Lincei). Three volumes of the second series, *Bilanci Generali*, appeared from 1903 to 1912. Publication is now resumed with vol. I., pt. I., of the first series, a collection of documents from the years 1262 to 1379, dealing with *La Regolazione delle Entrate e delle Spese*, edited by R. Cessi and P. Bosmin, with an historical introduction by the former and preface by Luigi Luzzatti (Padua, Draghi, 1925, pp. cclxxiii, 276).

The seventh volume of Professor Paul Kehr's *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum: Italia Pontificia* is now completed by the issue of part II. (Berlin, Weidmann, 1925, pp. xxvii, 263), embracing the lands of the republic of Venice, the province of Grado, and Histria, and containing 449 pontifical letters. At the end is an alphabetical index to vols. V.-VII.

The fifth volume of the *Mededeelingen* of the Dutch Historical Institute in Rome (the Hague, Nijhoff, 1925, pp. xlviii, 215) contains, along with the reports of the year's doings, several interesting historical papers. Among them may be mentioned Dr. H. M. R. Leopold's essay on early Italian dates, that of Professor A. W. Bijvanck on the illustrations in the manuscript of Oppianus's *Cynegetica*, valued as probably reproducing ancient hunting scenes, and that of Dr. D. J. Struik on Paulus van Middelburg (1445-1533), Dutch mathematician and scientist in Italy, bishop of Fossombrone from 1494, and his writings and activities toward the reform of the calendar. Leo X. made him chairman of the committee on that subject in the fifth Lateran Council (1512-1517); his work had its influence under Gregory XIII.

The Historical Institute of the Görres-Gesellschaft in Rome has published, as Band XX. of its *Quellen und Forschungen*, a biographical and literary study of *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist, und Staatsmann* (Paderborn, Schöning), by Ludwig Mohler.

Monsignore Giovanni Mercati, prefect of the Vatican Library, draws freely upon unpublished material concerning Italian humanism in his *Per la Cronologia della Vita e degli Scritti di Niccolò Perotti Arcivescovo di Siponto*, in the *Studi e Testi* (Rome, 1925).

*Masaniello* (Bari, Laterza), by Dr. Michelangelo Schipa, of the University of Naples, is a detailed and authoritative study of a famous episode and its whole background.

*The Life of Benito Mussolini*, by Margherita G. Sarfatti, bearing an introduction by Mussolini himself, has been translated by Frederic Whyte and published by Stokes.

Father Davide A. Perini, Augustinian, publishes (Rome, tip. Ausonia) a brief but learned and interesting history of *Genazzano e suo Territorio* (pp. 160), being the story of his native town, in Latian territory, near Praeneste, which played its part in the various struggles of the Colonnas in the Middle Ages and in our time was the birthplace of the brother Cardinals Vannutelli.

Upon intimations that a South American country had offered three million pesetas for the archives of Christopher Columbus remaining in the possession of his descendant the Duke of Veragua, the government of Spain has undertaken to buy them; a popular subscription was opened, to facilitate this, and, as we understand at the time of going to press, they are to be preserved in the Colegio Mayor Hispano-Americano in Seville.

The seventh volume of Father Antonio Astrain's *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España* (Madrid, 1925, pp. xi, 863) carries the history of the Society from 1705 to 1758, not only in Spain but in all the provinces of Spanish America and the Philippines.



Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Umberto Benassi, *Rileggendo la "Storia d'Italia" del Guicciardini* (Nuova Rivista Storica, September); Vittorio Adami, *Eugenio di Savoia Governatore di Milano, 1706-1716* (*ibid.*, November); Albert Pingaud, *Le Premier Royaume d'Italie*, concl., *Le Royaume pendant les Campagnes de Prusse et de Pologne* (Napoléon, November); Maurice Paléologue, *Un Grand Réaliste, Cavour*, III., IV. (Revue des Deux Mondes, December 1, 15); H. Puget, *Le Conseil d'État Espagnol et son Prédécesseur le Conseil de Castille* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, October-December).

#### GERMANY, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

A Deutsche Akademie was inaugurated in May, 1925, at Munich under the general presidency of G. Pfeilschifter, professor of ecclesiastical history at Munich, H. Oncken and H. Haushofer heading the scientific and practical sections respectively. The senate of 100 life members is to represent the leaders of German scholarship; among the new "immortals" are Burdach, Dehio, Dopsch, Eucken, Finke, Harnack, Husserl, Kehr, Marcks, Mausbach, Meinecke, Merkle, Ed. Meyer, Redlich, Schwartz, Stutz, Wilamowitz. The historical section undertakes to publish an abridgment of the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, a survey of the activities of Germans in foreign lands, and a history of Rhenish political and cultural development; it will also subsidize the collection of *Deutsche Geschichtsquellen des 19. Jahrhunderts* and will aid in the new edition of the works of Ranke.

The great German academies have undertaken, in collaboration with the Munich Historical Commission, a *Deutsches Biographisches Jahrbuch*, continuing the *Jahrbuch* begun by Bettelheim, which was intended as a supplement to the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*; vol. I. will contain the names of those who died in the years 1914-1916.

In the series *Deutsche Vergangenheit*, Dr. Johannes Bühler brings out a third of his excellent source-books of early German history, illustrated, *Die Sächsischen und Salischen Kaiser* (Leipzig, Insel-Verlag).

Dr. Berthold Altaner of Breslau has lately made another important contribution to the accessible sources for early Dominican history. To the series of *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Dominikanerordens in Deutschland* he has contributed a careful edition of the correspondence of the second general of the Dominicans, *Die Briefe Jordans von Sachsen, 1222-1237* (Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1925, pp. xii, 140), accompanied by a discussion of thirteenth-century piety.

The Prussian Historical Commission, founded in 1923 by the Berlin Academy of Sciences to assure the continuation of certain great historical series during the period of financial distress, has concentrated its efforts on the *Politische Correspondenz Friedrichs des Grossen*, the *Acta Borussica*, and the *Urkunden und Aktenstücke zur Geschichte des Gross-*

*en Kurfürsten*. In the first of these series, vol. XXXIX. has been finished, reaching to the year 1773; in the second, the acts of the central administration are being published, vol. XI. of these acts (1756-1758) now in print and vol. XII. (1759-1763) ready for the press; in the third, a beginning has been made on the twenty-second and last volume of documents relating to foreign affairs, which will deal with the powers of the North. Professor Voltz and the archivists Dr. Posner and Dr. Hein are respectively responsible for the three series.

Beiheft 4 of the *Historische Zeitschrift* consists of a study by Wilhelm Erman of *Der Tierische Magnetismus in Preussen vor und nach den Freiheitskriegen*; in Beiheft 5, Edwin Hölzle discusses *Die Idee einer Altgermanischen Freiheit vor Montesquieu*. Both appeared in 1925.

The Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums plans a great publication in many volumes of documents dealing with the relations of the Prussian state and the Jews from 1648 to 1812. The first part, entitled *Der Preussische Staat und die Juden; die Zeit des Grossen Kurfürsten und Friedrichs I.* (Berlin, Schwetschke, 1925, 2 vols., pp. xiii, 159, 546), has been ably and objectively handled by Selma Stern, who gives in the first volume, on the model furnished by the *Acta Borussica*, a brief exposition based on the archival material presented in the second.

A remarkably clear picture of Bismarck's political philosophy, presented from his own writings with the aid of an admirable interpretative introduction, is offered by Hans Rothfels in *Otto von Bismarck; Deutscher Staat; Ausgewählte Dokumente* (Munich, Dreimaskenverlag, 1925, pp. xlviii, 436). It constitutes vol. XXI. of the first series in the collection *Der Deutsche Staatsgedanke*.

The latest in the series of monographs on the German policy of Bavaria by Professor M. Doeberl of the University of Munich is his study of *Bayern und die Bismarckische Reichsgründung* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1925, pp. 328).

In addition to the volumes which General von Falkenhayn published on the World War before his death in 1922, there is now a biographical study of him, *Erich von Falkenhayn, General der Infanterie* (Berlin, Mittler), by General H. von Zühl.

The Schulte and Hofmann series of monographs on city history receives its seventh volume in Ernest Krockers *Handelsgeschichte der Stadt Leipzig; die Entwicklung des Leipziger Handels und der Leipziger Messen von der Gründung der Stadt bis zur Gegenwart* (Leipzig, Bielefeld, 1925, pp. 339). The fourth and sixth volumes of this series were Karl Steinacker's *Die Stadt Braunschweig* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1924, pp. 175) and Erich Keyser's *Die Stadt Danzig* (*ibid.*, 1925, pp. 164).

The fourth volume of Berthold Bretholz's important *Geschichte Böhmens und Mährens*, covering the years from 1793 to 1917, concludes the entire work (Reichenberg, Sollers Nachf., 1925, pp. 279).

The first part of vol. II. of the *Neue Oesterreichische Biographie* (Vienna, Amalthea Verlag, 1925, pp. 203) continues the studies of contemporary Austrians begun in 1913 under the direction of Bettelheim, with the collaboration of such men as Fournier, Friedjung, Pribram, and Redlich.

*Die Anfänge des Stehenden Heeres in Oesterreich*, by Eugen Heischmann (Vienna, Oesterreichischer Bundesverlag, 1925, pp. 260), is a well-documented dissertation of the University of Vienna indicating that, even before the Thirty Years' War, a beginning had been made in this direction.

Professor Louis Wittmer, of Zurich, has cast much light on the history of Austrian policy, especially in the years from 1802 to 1815, by a book on *Le Prince de Ligne, Jean de Müller, Frederic de Gentz et l'Autriche* (Paris, Champion, pp. 334), based on the very interesting correspondence of these three public men.

*Metternich*, by Heinrich, Ritter von Srbik (Munich, F. Bruckmann, 2 vols., pp. 1406), is a solid, competent, and authoritative biography, the author being professor of modern history in the University of Vienna.

*Die Politik Kaiser Karls und der Wendepunkt des Weltkrieges* find treatment at the hand of Professor Richard Fester of Halle (Munich, Lehmann, 1925, pp. 330). Other publications of this house are General H. Kerchnawe's *Der Zusammenbruch der Oesterreich-Ungarischen Wehrmacht im Herbst 1918, dargestellt nach Akten des K. u. K. Armeeoberkommandos und anderen Amtlichen Quellen* and Konter-Adm. Th. Winterhalter's *Die Oesterreichisch-Ungarische Kriegsmarine im Weltkrieg*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Carl Koehne, *Burgen, Burgmannen, und Städte* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXXIII. 1); Erich Marcks, *Goethes Briefwechsel mit Karl August* (*ibid.*); Ernst Heymann, *Das Testament König Friedrich Wilhelms III.* (*Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Kl., 1925, XIV.-XVI.); Hans Delbrück, *Von der Bismarck-Legende* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXXIII. 1); Leopold von Schlözer, *Bismarck-Briefe aus den Jahren 1861 und 1862* (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, October); Hans Rosenberg, *Die Maximen von Bismarcks Innerer Politik* (*ibid.*, November); Eduard von Wertheimer, *Neues zur Geschichte der Letzten Jahre Bismarcks, 1890-1898, nach Ungedruckten Akten* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXXIII. 2); Hajo Holborn, *Bismarck und Freiherr Georg von Werthern; auf Grund Unbekannter Briefe und Aktenstücke* (*Archiv für Politik und Geschichte*, November); Adolf Hasenclever, *Zur Geschichte des Helgolandvertrages vom 1. Juli, 1890* (*ibid.*); Raymond Poincaré, *L'Énigme Allemande en 1912* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, January 15); August Bach, *Das Erste Deutsche Weissbuch* (*Die Kriegsschuldfrage*, November).

## NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

General review: Eugène Hubert, *Histoire de Belgique* [1913-1924] (*Revue Historique*, November).

Vol. I., fasc. 3, of the *Oorkondenboek van het Sticht Utrecht* by the late S. Muller (Utrecht, 1924, pp. 297-471) comprises the years 1129-1197 (nos. 326-532), containing not only episcopal charters of the diocese, but also bulls and imperial diplomas addressed to the bishops.

In 1874 Dr. H. G. Hamaker published, among the *Werken* of the Historisch Genootschap (Utrecht), three volumes of *De Rekeningen der Grafelijkheid van Holland onder het Henegouwsche Huis*, and in 1879 two volumes of similar accounts, of the same period, for Zeeland. Now the same society issues the first volume of supplementary accounts for the Hainaut period, *De Rekeningen der Graven en Gravinnen uit het Henegouwsche Huis*, edited by Dr. H. J. Smit. These are accounts, preserved in the archives at Lille, of Count John II. and Philippina of Luxembourg, of their daughter-in-law Jeanne of Valois, and of her son Count William IV.; they range in date from 1299 to 1336, and supply multitudes of details for knowledge of court life and of prices and economics.

The Belgian Historical Institute at Rome has published the first volume of letters of Clement VI. relating to Belgian matters, and has in press the first, and in preparation the second, of two volumes of *Lettres d'Urbain V.*, 1362-1370, ed. A. Fierens and C. Tihon.

The Belgian Historical Commission has in press the second volume of the *Correspondance de la Cour d'Espagne sur les Affaires des Pays-Bas au XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, ed. Lonchay and Cuvelier. It has undertaken the issue of volumes of *Inventaire de la Correspondance des Ministres Belges à Londres, 1831-1839*, and *Documents relatifs à la Crise de la Neutralité Belge en 1848*, ed. A. de Ridder. In its *Bulletin*, LXXXIX. 1, appear reminiscences of a French ensign in the Austrian army, afterward Major-General Victor de Chaudelot, on the campaigns against the Brabant and French Revolutions in Belgium, 1789-1794; in no. 2, the letters, 1848, of the Austrian envoy at Brussels, Count Woyna, to Metternich and others at Vienna; in no. 3, a body of documents on the "nations" of students at the old university of Louvain.

A new line of interests connected with the American War of Independence is set forth in a work entitled *America and Belgium: the Influence of the United States upon the Belgian Revolution of 1789-1790* (London, Fisher Unwin), by Rev. Thomas K. Gorman.

The internal political struggles within the little grand-duchy of Luxembourg from 1918 to 1920 are related by the former director of public instruction, Nikolaus Welter, under the caption *Im Dienste* (Luxembourg, St. Pauls-Druckerei, 1925, pp. 231).

## NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

General review: J. Porcher, *Courrier Slave: Russie* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January).

*De Nordiska Rikena under Brömsebroförbundet* (Uppsala, 1925, pp. xx, 310) is a doctoral dissertation by Georg Landberg, treating of the years from 1541 to the death of Gustavus Vasa in 1560.

The (Norwegian) *Historisk Tidsskrift*, 1925, 4, contains a discussion by Dr. Poul Nørlund of the National Museum in Copenhagen, of those questions of change of climate which were raised by the excavations in the churchyard at Herjolfsnaes in Greenland, and an elaborate study of the history of St. Olav, by Johan Schreiner.

The third and concluding volume of the historical writings of the Norwegian archivist, historian, and publicist Mikael Birkeland has appeared under the auspices of the Norwegian Historical Society, edited by F. Ording (Oslo, Grøndahl and Son, 1925). This volume contains essays written between 1853 and 1878. Some of them have appeared in contemporary newspapers and periodicals, others appear here for the first time. Among the themes considered are negotiations for the establishing of a Norwegian bank in 1760-1773; the founding of Norway's university in 1811; Prince Christian and his oath of allegiance in Norway in 1656; and there are several interesting memorials regarding the housing and proper preservation of the Norwegian archives. Birkeland had a clear and vigorous style. He was one of the founders of the Norwegian Historical Society, and a prime mover in projects for the publication of the sources of Norwegian history.

Since 1921 there has appeared annually a publication under the title *Norvegia Sacra* (Oslo, Steen) under the direction of Oluf Kolsrud, professor in the faculty of theology at Oslo, devoted to ecclesiastical history, not only of Norway, but also of the whole western Church, particularly in the Middle Ages. The review, which appears under the auspices of the Lutheran bishops of Norway, contains their official reports and articles on matters of current interest as well as historical studies of wide range.

A Swedish historical dissertation of value to the parliamentary history of Sweden, and of thorough workmanship, is *Privilegiestriderna vid Frihetstidens Början, 1719-1723* (Uppsala, Almqvist and Wicksell, pp. xiii, 186), by Walfrid Enblom. Another which has recently come to us, and is perhaps from its subject of more interest to American readers, is *Hertig Karl av Södermanland* (*ibid.*, pp. xv, 227), by Gustaf Iverus; this is indicated as part I. of a larger work, and runs to the outbreak of war with Russia in 1788.

In a *Handbook* series published by the H. W. Wilson Company of New York, appears a volume of select readings, from recent periodicals, on Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia, and Bulgaria compiled by Milivoy S. Stanoyevich and entitled *Slavonic Nations of Yesterday and Today* (pp. xlv, 405).

In English translation has appeared *The Tragic Romance of the Emperor Alexander II. of Russia*, by M. Maurice Paléologue, former ambassador in St. Petersburg, the theme being the relations of the emperor with Catherine Dolgoruki, Princess Yurievski.

Under the auspices of the Tsentrarkhiv at Moscow, Professor M. N. Pokrovski of that city has published the first volume of a collection of the correspondence of Pobiedonovtsev with his sovereign, *Pisma Pobedonovtseva k Aleksandru III.* (1925).

An eventful period of Russian history is covered by the *Souvenirs du Baron N. Wrangel, 1847-1920*, issued under the descriptive title *Du Service au Bolchevisme* (Paris, Plon, 1926, pp. 356).

*Rossiya v Mirovoy Voinye* (Berlin, Slovo), by Gen. G. N. Danilov, is an account of Russia's state of preparation in 1914, of her measures respecting mobilization, and of the workings of the military machine during the first months of the war, by one who during that period was director of military operations, under the Grand-duke Nicholas as commander-in-chief, and before that had been quartermaster general.

An important documentary contribution to the history of the first Russian Revolution, that of March (O.S., February), 1917, begins with the publication of the first volume of Zaslavski and Katstorovich's *Khronika Febralskoi Revolutsii* (Leningrad, 1924).

To the four volumes of correspondence of Izvolski when Russian ambassador in Paris that had been published by the German Foreign Office, Dr. Friedrich Stieve has added a fifth volume, also brought out under the auspices of the Foreign Office, consisting of an historical narrative illustrated by copious quotations from the original documents. This volume has now been published in English translation, *Izvolsky and the World War* (London, Allen and Unwin).

*Das Zaristische Russland im Weltkrieg*, vol. I., published by the Russian government in Leningrad at the beginning of this year, with a preface by Professor M. N. Pokrovski, contains the diplomatic correspondence of Russia with Turkey, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Italy in the period immediately preceding the entrance of those states into the World War.

The history of Warsaw is competently set forth by Count Renaud Przezdziecki in *Varsovie* (Warsaw, Biblioteka Polska, 1925, pp. 388).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. M. Mjelde, *Eyktaarstad-problemet og Vinlands-reisene* ([Norwegian] Historisk Tidsskrift, R. 5, Bd. VI.); C. Sprinchorn, *Sjuttonhundratalets Planer och Förslag till Svensk Kolonisation i Främmande Världsdelar* ([Swedish] Historisk Tidsskrift, 1923); Helmut Lothar, *Zur Geschichte des Pietismus in Schweden und Dänemark* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLIV. 4); W. F. Reddaway, *Don Sebastian de Llano and the Danish Revolution [of 1772]* (English Historical Review, January); L. Konopczynski, *Lars von Engeströms Mission i Polen, 1787-1791* ([Swedish] Historisk Tidsskrift, 1924, 1).



**SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE**

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: V. N. Zlatarski, *The Making of the Bulgarian Nation* (Slavonic Review, December); Slobodan Jovanović, *Serbia in the Early Seventies* (*ibid.*); *Neue Dokumente über das Serbisch-Bulgarische Bündnis von 1912* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, December).

**ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN**

*Four Centuries of Modern Iraq* (Oxford, Clarendon Press), by Stephen H. Longrigg, tells usefully the story of Turkish, or at times nominally Turkish, rule in that region.

The statesmanship and administration of Warren Hastings are illustrated to a most important extent by vol. IV., 1772–1775, of the *Calendar of Persian Correspondence*, published in Calcutta by the Imperial Record Office.

A useful general survey of a subject on which very few general works have been written is a little book by D. R. Gadgil of Nagpur, *The Industrial Evolution of India in Recent Times* (Oxford University Press, pp. xix, 242), which, among other matters, presents with special impressiveness the effects of the rapid development of transportation in destroying or checking the native handicrafts.

A history of Japan from 1549 to 1578 by Father Luis Frois, Portuguese Jesuit missionary in that country for 34 years, a book long supposed to be lost, has been found in the library of the Ajuda at Lisbon. A German translation of it, *Geschichte Japans*, is now announced for publication by Martinus Nijhoff of the Hague, with suitable introduction and commentary. It is understood to be of much importance.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Ed. Meyer, *Die Volksstämme Kleinasiens, das erste Auftreten der Indogermanen in der Geschichte, und die Probleme ihrer Ausbreitung* (Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., 1925, XVIII.–XXI.); J. N. Farquhar, *The Apostle Thomas in North India* (Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, January); Adm. G. A. Ballard, *The Arrival of the Dutch and British in the Indian Ocean* (Mariner's Mirror, January); H. Sée, *Les Ventes de la Compagnie des Indes à Nantes, 1723–1733* (Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises, 1925, 4); H. L. Hoskins, *The First Steam Voyage to India* (Geographic Review, January); Sir Frederic Whyte, *Political Evolution in India* (Foreign Affairs, January); O. Franke, *Der Ursprung der Chinesischen Geschichtschreibung* (Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., 1925, XXII.–XXV.).

**AFRICA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN**

General review: Ch. A. Julien, *Histoire de l'Afrique du Nord; Algérie, Tunisie, Maroc* [1919–1925] (Revue Historique, January).

Colonel Paul Azan, known to many Americans, is the author of a volume on *L'Émir Abd-el-Kader, 1808-1883*, having the significant subtitle, *Du Fanatisme Musulman au Patriotisme Français* (Paris, Hachette, pp. viii, 212), based on thorough researches in military archives, and on full personal knowledge of Algerian conditions.

Pierre Alype, one of the two advocates who presented the application of Abyssinia for admission to the League of Nations, offers a history of that country under the title *Sous la Couronne de Salomon; l'Empire des Négus* (Paris, Plon, 1925, pp. 308), whose chief interest lies in the most recent period, with which the author is personally familiar.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Colonel Godchot, *Au Maroc*, VII.-X. (Nouvelle Revue, November 1-December 15).

### AMERICA

#### GENERAL ITEMS

The Carnegie Institution published in March the first volume of the *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, edited by Professor John S. Bassett. It is a volume of 508 pages, extending to the end of April, 1814, and of the Creek campaign. It is expected that the second volume will follow before the end of the year. The *Guide to British West Indian Archive Materials, in London and in the Islands* (pp. 535) is to be published early in April. The third volume of Dr. Burnett's *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress* will also be issued soon, the index having been completed. The first volume of *Judicial Cases concerning American Slavery and the Negro*, edited by Mrs. R. C. H. Catterall, has nearly all been read in galley-proof. It contains the English, Virginian, and Kentucky cases, its composition differing considerably from that which was announced in the last *Annual Report* of the Department of Historical Research. Vol. II. of the Bandelier documents, *Historical Documents relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya, etc.*, edited by Professor C. W. Hackett, is also in press; the documents in this volume relate to Nueva Vizcaya. Dr. Stock's second volume of *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments respecting North America* has been completed and entered for publication; it covers the period from 1689 to 1702. Of the *Calendar of Manuscripts in Paris Archives relating to the Mississippi Valley* prepared by Mrs. Surrey, the revision of vol. I., extending through 1738, has been completed, making one-half of the work. It will be reproduced by the planograph process rather than by print, and should be available for distribution at some time in the summer. Mr. W. G. Leland sails for Paris in April, to finish vol. I. (Libraries) of the *Paris Guide*.

The Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress has recently acquired several reports and letters from Sir Dudley Ryder, attorney general, to the Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations, the Treasury, the Privy Council, etc., 1748-1749; 18 letters of Richard Clai-

borne to various persons, 1780-1782; reports of the Attorney General, 1790-1818; letters of Senator Thomas Ewing, 1818-1845; papers and letters of Senator George P. Wetmore; four original letters of President Harding; letters of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice to Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt, 1894-1909; and miscellaneous papers of Daniel M. and J. Napier Brodhead, 1779-1907, including letters of Presidents Washington, Van Buren, and Buchanan. The Modern Language Association of America, with funds collected from fifty libraries, has obtained photostat copies of 49 manuscripts or rare printed books in European libraries. These reproductions are deposited in the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress and can be lent, preference in lending being given to scholars of subscribing institutions.

Mr. Charles Evans has lately printed the ninth volume of his invaluable and monumental *American Bibliography* (pp. 491), covering the years 1793 and 1794. The additional newspapers, the publications of the United States government, and the multitude of political and other pamphlets, and broadsides, together with Mr. Evans's bibliographical notes, cause those two years alone to fill a volume, presenting more than 3000 titles. The workmanship of text and notes can not be too highly praised.

Students of diplomatic history may like to know of the new list of publications on the foreign relations of the United States, now for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, *Price List* no. 65, eighth edition.

The *locus* of the Naval History Society having been removed to New York, and its collections deposited with those of the New York Historical Society, there has recently been incorporated in Washington a Naval Historical Foundation, with some means, the object of which is to procure, for the archives of the Navy Department and ultimately for the naval section of the National Archives, manuscripts and other materials for the history of the United States Navy. The incorporators are the Secretary of the Navy, Rear-Admirals Hilary P. Jones, Austin M. Knight, tary of the Navy, Rear-Admirals Austin M. Knight, Hilary P. Jones, Elliot Snow, General George Richards, Captain Dudley W. Knox, and J. F. Jameson.

The firm of Crowell has published a *History of Economic Progress in the United States*, by Professor Walter W. Jennings of the University of Kentucky.

The *Journal* of the American Irish Historical Society for the year 1925, vol. XXIV. (New York, the Society, pp. 368), consists, substantially, one-third of proceedings, one-third of historical papers, and one-third of necrology. Of the historical papers the major portion is contributed by Mr. Michael J. O'Brien, who brings forward much interesting matter, on Land Grants to Irish Settlers in the Colony and State of Virginia, on Irish Settlers in Connecticut in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, illustrated by the Sullivans, Murphys, and McCarthys, and on "the Scotch-Irish Myth", which he discusses with much cogency—and with extraordinary warmth.

The *Year-Book* for 1924-1925 of the Swedish Historical Society of America contains a paper on Swedish Pioneers in Kansas, by Theodore W. Anderson, one on the First Settlements in the Kandiyohi Region in Southern Minnesota and their Fate in the Indian Outbreak of 1862; but as the main element in the contents the editor reproduces, in Swedish and in English translation, some historical articles on the early Swedes in Minnesota which fifty years ago Colonel Hans Mattson secured for the *Minnesota Stats Tidning* from persons especially cognizant of the facts. The installments in the present *Year-Book* are an account of the Swedish settlements of Marine in Washington County (1850) and of Vasa, Goodhue County (1853). The past year saw also the foundation of a Norwegian Historical Society.

The president of Witmarsum Theological Seminary, Dr. J. T. Hartzler, has brought out through the Central Mennonite Publication Board, Danvers, Ill., an intelligent volume on *Education among the Mennonites of America*.

#### ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The British Stationery Office has lately published the fourth volume, November, 1718-December, 1722, of the *Journal of the Commissioners for Trade and Plantations*, and a volume of the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, extending from July 1, 1711, to June 30, 1712.

Mr. Theodore D. Jervy has brought out through the State Company, Columbia, South Carolina, a volume entitled *The Slave Trade, Slavery, and Color*.

*Antoine Benezet, de Saint-Quentin, un Quaker Français en Amérique* (Toulouse, Société d'Édition de Toulouse, 1925, pp. 44) by Dr. Jacques Pannier, secretary of the Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, is an agreeable summary of Benezet's career, based mainly on his *Memoirs* (Philadelphia, 1816) published by Robert Vaux. Attention is given to his teaching, missionary, and charitable activities, to his pacifism, his labors against the slave trade, and his attitude during the War for Independence.

The Cokesbury Press, Nashville, has reprinted Jesse Lee's *Short History of Methodists in the United States, 1766-1809* (Baltimore, 1810), with a sketch of the author by E. L. Shettles.

Mr. Philip Guedalla has collected a series of eighteenth-century studies relating to our Revolution in a volume entitled *Independence Day: a Sketch Book* (London, Murray), embracing essays on George III., Lord North, Chatham, Burke, Burgoyne, Cornwallis, Washington, Franklin, Adams, Hamilton, Louis XVI., and Lafayette.

The Princeton University Press will before long publish a small book on *The American Revolution considered as a Social Movement*, four lectures delivered at Princeton last November, on the Vanuxem Foundation, by J. F. Jameson.

The relations of the Dutch to the War for American Independence are evidently to be treated by M. Francis P. Renaut more elaborately than we had supposed, for he plans to devote six volumes to the subject, of which the first, dealing with the period of Dutch neutrality, *Les Provinces Unies et la Guerre d'Amérique*, I. *De la Neutralité à la Belligérance, 1775-1780* (Paris, Graouli, 1924, pp. 432), is the one we have already mentioned as published.

*The Life and Work of Thomas Green Fessenden, 1771-1837*, by Porter G. Perrin, is no. 4 of the second series of *University of Maine Studies*.

Professor George M. Stephenson of the University of Minnesota has prepared a *History of American Immigration, 1820-1924*, which Ginn and Company have published.

Dr. Carter G. Woodson has brought together a volume of material from the manuscript schedules of the census of 1830, to which is given the title *Free Negro Heads of Families in the United States in 1830*. There is a brief account of the free negro (Washington, Association for the Study of Negro Life and History).

Joshua Toulmin Smith's *Journal in America, 1837-1838*, edited by Floyd B. Streeter, is issued as no. 41 of *Heartman's Historical Series* (Metuchen, New Jersey, Charles F. Heartman).

Messrs. Putnam have brought out the *Life and Letters of Rear-Adm. Stephen B. Luce, U. S. Navy, 1827-1917*, by Rear-Admiral Gleaves.

The Hunter-Trader-Trapper Company of Columbus, Ohio, has brought out *A Trooper with Custer and other Historic Incidents of the Battle of Little Big Horn*, by E. A. Brininstool. This is vol. I. of what is termed the *Frontier Series*.

*The Conquest of the Philippines by the United States, 1898-1925*, by Moorfield Storey and Marcial Lichauco, is published by Messrs. Putnam.

Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons announce for early publication the first volume of a political and social history of the recent period, *Our Times: the United States, 1900-1925*, by Mark Sullivan, the well-known Washington correspondent of newspapers.

*W. Murray Crane, a Man and a Brother*, is the title given to a biography of the late Senator from Massachusetts, from the pen of the late Solomon B. Griffin of the *Springfield Republican*. The book has an introduction by President Coolidge (Little, Brown, and Company).

No book has made a more interesting contribution to the political history of the United States from 1911 to 1917, and few have made a more interesting contribution to that of Europe in the later of these years, than *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, edited by Professor Charles Seymour (Houghton Mifflin, 1926, pp. xxiv, 471; viii, 508).

*The Formative Period of the Federal Reserve System* (Houghton Mifflin Company, pp. x, 320), by W. P. G. Harding, now governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, is valuable as an inside account of the organization of the Federal Reserve Board and of its early problems and operations, by one who was an original member of the board and its governor from 1916 to 1922.

Through the generous support of Mr. Adolph S. Ochs, it has been possible to revive the valued annual, the *American Year Book*, and to publish its record of events and progress in political, legal, economic and industrial, scientific, intellectual, and social fields, in the United States especially, for the year 1925. The plan is that which was made familiar by the ten volumes issued from 1910 to 1919, with which year the series was suspended, but much expansion will be observed. The volume (pp. xxxv, 1158) is edited by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart and William M. Schuyler, with the aid of the American Year Book Corporation, representing many learned societies, and of 256 contributors.

#### LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

##### NEW ENGLAND

In 1897 Miss C. Alice Baker printed privately an interesting volume, the fruit of much research, of *True Stories of New England Captives carried to Canada during the Old French and Indian War*. After further researches, her friend and associate Miss Emma L. Coleman issues from the Southworth Press of Portland, Me., two volumes of *New England Captives carried to Canada between 1677 and 1760, during the French and Indian Wars*, repeating in less detail the stories told in Miss Baker's book, now out of print, but adding much else.

The October–November serial of the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society contains a paper by Mr. W. C. Ford on a Seventeenth-Century Letter of Marque, namely, on the privateering adventures of Sir Kenelm Digby in the Mediterranean, 1627–1629; a discussion by Mr. Harold Murdock of Rev. Peter Thacher's Report on the Battle of Bunker Hill; and an account of the Portraits of Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette presented to the Continental Congress in 1784, but apparently lost since about 1835. The society has published the seventh volume of the *Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts*, covering all sessions of the General Courts of 1726 and 1727, and presenting a multitude of details concerning the Eastern Indians, new plantations, finance, and trade; also the first volume of the *Winthrop Papers*, from a collection so rich that this whole volume is filled with the family papers anterior in date to Governor John Winthrop's resolve to emigrate. It ends with 1628.

*A Boston Boy the First Martyr to American Liberty* is the title of a booklet by Judge Emil Baensch of Manitowoc, Wisconsin. The martyr



was Christopher Snider, son of a German immigrant, and the date was Feb. 22, 1770.

The January number of the *Essex Institute Historical Collections* includes, besides continuations, a list of Salem vessels in 1765.

The Seth Pomeroy Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution has published at Northampton, Mass., under the editorial care of Rev. Henry G. Smith, *Seth Pomeroy*, an address given before several societies by the late Thomas M. Shepherd (d. 1923) of that city, accompanied by several letters of Seth Pomeroy, and a full description, from Mr. Shepherd's will, of the provision made by him for the Shepherd Memorial Museum intended to preserve articles "of historic and educational value which will show the manner of living and character-building of the early people of New England".

*A Brief History of the American Legion in Massachusetts* (pp. 53) from the skilled pen of Professor Claude M. Fuess, department historian, presents a competent and interesting account of the formation and early development of the Legion in that state. A similar history of the Legion in Kansas has been brought out by the department historian there, Thomas A. Lee, of Topeka, and can be had from him.

#### MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The October number of the *Quarterly Journal* of the New York State Historical Association contains the hitherto unprinted minutes of meetings of incorporators, association, and trustees (1898-1925), and an index to the *Proceedings*, vols. I. to XXIII., and to the *Quarterly Journal*, vols. I. to VI. There is also a brief biographical sketch of the president of the association, Dr. Frank H. Severance.

The New York Historical Society's *Quarterly Bulletin* has in the January number an article, by Joseph W. Greene, jr., on New York City's First Railroad, the New York and Harlem, 1832-1867.

The January number of the *Proceedings* of the New Jersey Historical Society includes an article by Dr. John M. Thomas on the Influence of Frontier Life on American Christianity; one by Capt. Richmond C. Holcomb on the Early Dutch Maps of Upper Delaware Valley; and the first installment of a paper by E. Alfred Jones on the Loyalists of New Jersey in the Revolution. This is continued in the April number, which also has papers on Lady Carteret, wife of Sir George, by Charles L. Meyers, on Washington's Headquarters at Coryell's Ferry, by Capt. R. C. Holcomb, and on the California Argonauts from Jersey City, by W. H. Richardson.

The most important acquisition to the Division of Archives in the Pennsylvania State Library during the past year has been William Penn's first charter to the people of Pennsylvania, granted April 25, 1682, and presented to the library by popular subscription through the efforts of the

*Philadelphia Public Ledger*. A handsome reproduction of the charter—facsimile and transliteration, with historical comment by Albert C. Myers—may be obtained from William Moland's Sons, Philadelphia.

Among the articles in the January number of the *Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* are: Old Mills of Mill Creek, Lower Merion, by Charles R. Barker; Colonel James Burd, Defender of the Frontier, by Irma A. Watts; and an installment of Joshua Gilpin's Journal of a Tour from Philadelphia through the Western Counties of Pennsylvania, in September and October, 1809.

*Papers* read before the Lancaster County Historical Society include a sketch of Joseph Shirk, Astronomer, Mathematician, and Inventor, by A. G. Seyfert (October 2); some account of the newspaper, *Lancaster Union and Tribune*, by Albert K. Hostetter (November 6); and the address (in substance) of Dr. Albert C. Myers at the unveiling of the Martin Chartier marker (issue of December 4).

The January number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* includes a study by John E. Potter entitled the Place of Pittsburgh in History; one by Percy B. Caley on Child Life in Colonial Western Pennsylvania (to be continued); and a paper by John A. Emery on the McKean Tract, a body of lands in Allegheny County long held by the Spanish heirs of Thomas McKean.

*The Road Policy of Pennsylvania* (pp. 121), a doctoral dissertation of the University of Pennsylvania, by Wilbur C. Plummer, is an historical study of roads and road administration in Pennsylvania from the earliest settlements to the present time. Nearly two-thirds of the monograph is concerned with the period prior to the coming of the automobile.

#### SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

Vol. XLIV. of the *Archives of Maryland* (Baltimore, Maryland Historical Society, 1925, pp. xxiii, 717) is the tenth edited by the late Dr. Bernard C. Steiner, and the twenty-first devoted to proceedings of the general assembly. It carries the latter through the sessions of August, 1745, March, June, and November, 1746, and May, 1747, and gives also the texts of acts passed. Struggles with Governors Bladen and Ogle occupy much space. The editor, in an introduction, endeavors by means of the recorded divisions to show the party lines.

The principal article in the December number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, aside from continuations hitherto mentioned, is by John E. Uhler and is entitled the Delphian Club: a Contribution to the Literary History of Baltimore in the Early Nineteenth Century. The number contains also a list of judges of the court of appeals of Maryland since the Revolution, giving the period of service of each and also the county to which he was accredited. The March number has an address on Maryland's Religious History, by the late Dr. Steiner, and some entertaining letters of two young women, Molly and Hetty Tilghman, 1783-1785.

It is announced that volumes V. and VI. of the Virginia War History Commission's series of source materials are in the hands of the printer. These volumes are entitled *Virginia Military Organization in the World War*, and *Virginia Communities in War Time*, respectively.

In the January number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* appears an interesting and valuable article by Mr. William G. Stanard, on the Homes of the Virginia Historical Society, Past, Present, and Future, accompanied by numerous illustrations. This number of the *Magazine* contains also the concluding installment of Mr. Fairfax Harrison's study of the Proprietors of the Northern Neck, which is likewise accompanied by portraits and other illustrations. Of no small interest is the inventory and appraisement of the estate of Benjamin Harrison, 1791.

The principal contributions to the January number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* are a paper by Professor Percy S. Flippin of Mercer University entitled William Gooch, Successful Royal Governor of Virginia, and one by H. W. Scarborough on Quaker Pioneers of Shenandoah and Rockingham Counties. The Papers of Archibald Stuart, which are concluded in this issue, contain several letters from Jefferson.

The January number of *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* contains articles on Exploration of 1650 in Southern Virginia, by Louis D. Scisco, and Some Typical *London Times* Views of the Southern Confederacy, by A. Curtis Wilgus. Among the documents are three letters of William C. Rives, and some notes from the records of York County.

Articles in the January number of the *North Carolina Historical Review* are: the Study of the New South, by Benjamin B. Kendrick; Travel and Transportation in Colonial North Carolina, by F. W. Clonts; and North Carolina in the School Geographies 110 Years ago, by Charles L. Coon. In the series of North Carolina Tracts of the Eighteenth Century are: (VI.), the Petition of Reuben Searcy and Others (1759), and George Sims's Address to the People of Granville County (1765), both reprinted from vol. XXI. of this journal; and (VII.), Hermon Husband's *Some Remarks on Religion* (1761). In the section of Historical Notes, contributed by C. L. Corbitt, are the "Humble Address" of the grand jury on the subject of quit-rents (March 29, 1735), Governor Gabriel Johnston's reply of the same day, and the governor's speech to the council and house of commons on the same subject, August 9 following.

In 1908 appeared the first volume of a *History of North Carolina* (1584-1783), by Capt. Samuel A. Ashe (Greensborough, Charles L. Van Noppen). The second volume of that work (which is almost double the size of the first), bringing the narrative down to the year 1925, has now appeared (Raleigh, Edwards and Broughton Printing Company). The

volume contains many portraits and comprehensive indexes to both volumes.

*The Albemarle of Other Days*, by Mary Rawlings, has been brought out in Charlottesville by the Michie Company.

The *Florida Historical Society Quarterly* for January has the first part of a paper by Mrs. Jeannette Thurber Connor on the Nine Old Wooden Forts of St. Augustine; an account, by A. H. Phinney, of the affair of 1812 in Florida sometimes called the "Patriot War", to which is given the title the First Spanish-American War; the third and concluding part of Dr. William E. Dunn's narrative of the Occupation of Pensacola Bay, 1689-1700; and some material concerning the Federal Raid on Tampa Bay in October, 1863, taken from Moore's *Rebellion Record*.

The Florida Historical Society has brought out *A History of Jacksonville*, by T. Frederick Davis.

The *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* bearing the date April, 1925, has a paper by A. Curtis Wilgus on Spanish-American Patriot Activity along the Gulf Coast of the United States, 1811-1822; a Brief History of St. Landry Parish, by William J. Sandoz; an address by George A. Simpson on the Early History of the Flag of the United States; an account, by Laura L. Porteus, of a Suit for Debt in the Governor's Court, New Orleans, 1770, with documents; and a genealogical sketch of Bienville, by André Lafargue.

Tome XVII. of the *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris* contains portions, copied by Claude Delisle and preserved in the Archives Hydrographiques, of a journal kept in Louisiana, from February 1 to May 19, 1700, by the Jesuit Father Paul du Ru (1666-1741), who accompanied Iberville that year.

#### WESTERN STATES

Following are the articles in the March number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*: the Literary Motive in the Writing of History, by Professor Homer C. Hockett; the American Fur Company's Fishing Enterprises on Lake Superior, by Miss Grace L. Nute; the Origin of the Whig Party in Tennessee, by Thomas P. Abernethy of the University of Chattanooga; and the Mercenary Factor in the Creation of the Union Army, by Fred A. Shannon of the Iowa State Teachers' College. The *Review* prints in this number Captain Lemuel Ford's Journal of an Expedition to the Rocky Mountains made by the First Regiment of United States Dragoons, 1835. Hugh Evans's journal of an expedition made by this same regiment across Oklahoma in the preceding year was printed in the September issue of the *Chronicles of Oklahoma*.

New light has been thrown on the earlier explorations of the Missouri River by Baron Marc de Villiers in *La Découverte du Missouri et l'Histoire du Fort D'Orléans, d'après des Documents Inédits* (Paris, Champion, 1925). The author believes that LaSalle did not explore the Ohio.

The pages of the July number of the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* are chiefly devoted to a biographical sketch, by C. B. Galbreath, of John Henry Kagi, a member of the John Brown party, together with an extensive collection of Kagi's personal letters, newspaper correspondence, etc.

The Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio *Publications* includes with the society's annual report for 1925 a body of Notes on Proposed Settlements in the West, 1755-1757, found in the Toner Collection in the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress. No trace has been found of the original from which Dr. Toner copied these notes, neither has the author of them been identified, but Professor Beverly W. Bond, jr., who has edited them for the *Publications*, points out that the author was especially well informed and that the notes are of great value for both the military and economic history of the period. Another volume of the society's publications is *The Correspondence of John Cleves Symmes, Founder of the Miami Purchase* (New York, Macmillan), also edited by Professor Bond.

The Indiana Historical Society, through the appointment of a special commission, has inaugurated a movement for the observance throughout the Old Northwest of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the capture of Fort Sackville, at Vincennes, by George Rogers Clark, February 25, 1779. The erection of a permanent memorial, the publication of historical material, and various meetings, are contemplated. The *Indiana History Bulletin* of February announces that the plans for the celebration have been broadened so as to include participation by the whole of the Old Northwest.

The contents of the December number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* include: *Pioneers and Pathfinders of New France*, by Dr. James A. Woodburn; *Morris Birkbeck's Estimate of the People of Princeton in 1817*, by Lucius C. Embree; a *Sketch of the Early Presbyterian Church in Indiana*, by J. H. Barnard; and the *Journal of an Emigrating Party of Pottawattomie Indians, 1838*, presumed to have been written by William Polke. The original is in the Fort Wayne Public Library.

The July number of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* includes a biographical account, by Merritt Starr, of General Horace Capron (1804-1885), commissioner of agriculture of the United States 1867-1871, adviser and commissioner of agriculture under the Japanese government 1871-1875. The article pertains more largely to General

Capron's Japanese mission. Other contents are: an account of the Lafayette Centennial at Shawneetown, May 14, 1925, with an address by Cornelius J. Doyle, and including the address of welcome delivered by Judge James Hall at the time of Lafayette's visit; a pen picture, by William A. Richardson, jr., of Quincy at the time of the Lincoln-Douglas debate; and a biographical sketch, by Mrs. Jessie Palmer Webber, of the late Edmund J. James.

The committee appointed by the president of the Illinois State Historical Society in accordance with an act of the general assembly of Illinois to designate the site of Fort de Crèvecoeur has brought out its report, *The Site of Fort de Crèvecoeur* (pp. 42, printed by authority of the state of Illinois). One-half the pamphlet is a discussion of the problem, the other half an assemblage of the documentary evidence in the case.

In the January number of the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* Rev. W. D. Pike, of Bardstown, Kentucky, reviews Mr. Young E. Allison's paper, the Curious Legend of Louis Philippe in Kentucky, which appeared in the issue of that journal for July, 1925, taking sharp issue with Mr. Allison upon the majority of his conclusions. A paper by Rev. Paul J. Foik, Among the Indian Chiefs of the Great Miami, pertains to conditions and events in 1785-1786 and is largely documentary in character. Rev. John Rothensteiner gives an account of the Sulpicians in Illinois. There is also an address, the Pioneer Explorers, delivered by Professor A. C. McLaughlin in December of last year at the unveiling of tablets in memory of Marquette, Joliet, LaSalle, and Tonti.

Among the articles in the January number of the *Register* of the Kentucky State Historical Society are: Bryant's Station and its Founder, William Bryant, by Thomas J. Bryant; and the Cincinnati and Green River Railway Company, by Edgar B. Wesley.

Professor Charles M. Perry of the University of Oklahoma contributes to the January number of the *Michigan History Magazine* an article on the Formative Influences in the Early Life of Henry Philip Tappan, first president of the University of Michigan, and Mr. James L. Smith records some reminiscences of Dr. Tappan by Dr. John P. Stoddard. Mr. George B. Catlin begins in this issue of the *Magazine* a series of Little Journeys in Journalism, the subject of this first article being Michael J. Dee, for many years editor of the *Detroit News*. Another series begun in this issue is a History of the Michigan State Federation of Women's Clubs, by Irma T. Jones.

The *Burton Historical Collection Leaflet* for January contains an article by M. M. Quaife on Capital Punishment in Detroit.

Among the recent acquisitions of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin are the papers of John G. McMynn, one of the notable educators of the state, those of Joshua Hathaway, a pioneer surveyor and landholder, and many letters written to the late Major F. W. Oakley of Madi-



son, Civil War veteran, together with numerous letters written by Mrs. Oakley from the theatre of the war. The latter collection is of particular interest for its data concerning "Confederate Rest" in Madison, where many Southern soldiers, prisoners of war, are buried.

The latest publication of the Wisconsin Historical Society is *Wisconsin's Gold Star List* (pp. 224), a list of Wisconsin's soldiers, sailors, marines, and nurses who died in the federal service during the World War. The book was prepared by John J. Gregory. Miss Ruth Hardaker is actively engaged in preparing for the society a calendar of the Tennessee papers in the Draper Collection, similar to the calendars already published of its Kentucky Papers and Preston and Virginia Papers.

In the March number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* Dr. Frank C. Richmond has an article on Wisconsin's Efforts in Behalf of Soldier Rehabilitation, Theodora W. Youmans gives an account of a Pioneer Church at Prospect, Clara Lyon Hayes continues her biography of William Penn Lyon, and Dr. Joseph Schafer concludes his Epic of a Plain Yankee Family. Using the title the Courts and History the editor, Dr. Schafer, contributes a well-reasoned examination of Judge Lyon's decision in 1890 that the reading of passages of Scripture in public schools constitutes sectarian instruction within the meaning of the state constitution.

Among the accessions of manuscripts in the Minnesota Historical Society are several hundred letters written by John and Nancy Aiton, missionaries to the Sioux (beginning 1848), and abstracts of the licenses to trade with Indians in the interior, issued in the colony of Quebec, 1767-1776. The abstracts were compiled at Ottawa, under the direction of Dr. Wayne E. Stevens, for a group of historical agencies.

The *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* has in the January number a study by Herman C. Nixon of the Populist Movement in Iowa, and one by Thomas P. Christensen entitled Denmark [Iowa], an Early Stronghold of Congregationalism.

The December number of the *Palimpsest* contains an account, by J. A. Swisher, of the speech made by General Grant at Des Moines, Sept. 29, 1875, which gave rise to much controversy, caused chiefly by a perverted sentence, as reported in the newspapers. The January number has an article by Ruth A. Gallaher on the First Church in Iowa; that of February has one by Erik M. Eriksson on the Boundaries of Iowa. The latter article is accompanied by maps.

The January number of the *Annals of Iowa* contains an article by George Gallarno, How Iowa cared for Orphans of her Soldiers of the Civil War, and a continuation of the Civil War Diary of Benjamin F. Pearson.

The Missouri Historical Society, which has long possessed Charles Gratiot's letter-book of the period 1798-1816, has lately acquired his orig-

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—42.

inal letter-books for 1769-1779 and for 1792-1794, the early ones written from Montreal and Kahokia, the later ones from St. Louis, and embracing material of much importance for the history of St. Louis and the fur-trade. The society has also received from the grandchildren of William G. Pettus, secretary of the first Constitutional Convention of Missouri, a collection of 250 manuscripts, including a detailed account of the convention's proceedings throughout its sessions, June 12-July 19, 1820. The society expects to publish them, edited by Thomas M. Marshall.

In the January number of the *Missouri Historical Review* Rev. John E. Rothensteiner has an article on the Earliest History of Mine La Motte, W. D. Vandiver gives some Reminiscences of General John B. Clark, and Rollin J. Britton writes concerning Adam-Ondi-Ahman, being a chapter in Mormon history. Thomas S. Barclay's studies of the Liberal Republican Movement in Missouri are continued.

The January number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* contains two articles, namely, the Mississippi Whigs and the Annexation of Texas, by James E. Winston, and the Significance of the Jacksboro Indian Affairs of 1871, by C. C. Rister. Some supplementary documents relating to the Chambuscado-Rodríguez Expedition are contributed by J. Lloyd Mecham, and the Diary of C. C. Cox (from Texas to California in 1849), edited by Mabelle E. Martin, is concluded.

The *Chronicles of Oklahoma* prints in the September issue the Journal of Sergeant Hugh Evans of the United States Dragoon Regiment, covering an expedition in 1834 across the present state of Oklahoma. Another section of Evans's Journal, covering a campaign to the Rocky Mountains in 1835, will, it is stated, be published by the Kansas Historical Society. Capt. Lemuel Ford's journal of the Rocky Mountain expedition is printed in the March number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*. The original of Evans's Journal, which is in the custody of the Oregon Historical Society, was transcribed and edited by Fred E. Perrine, and is here printed with additional notes by Grant Foreman. In the same issue of the *Chronicles* is the text of the so-called Okmulgee Constitution, a proposed organic law for the Indian Territory, prepared by the general council of the territory convened at Okmulgee in December, 1870. There is also a History of the Construction of the Frisco Railway Lines in Oklahoma, by James L. Allhands.

The American Book Company has published *A Brief History of North Dakota*, by Herbert C. Fish and R. M. Black.

The *New Mexico Historical Review*, a quarterly publication of the Historical Society of New Mexico, made its first appearance in January. The editors are Lansing B. Bloom and Paul A. F. Walter. This first number contains an installment of a paper on New Mexico and the Great War, by President Frank H. H. Roberts of Junior College, El Paso; an account, by Francis T. Cheetham, of the First Term of the American Court in Taos, New Mexico; and the first chapter in a study, by Pro-

fessor George P. Hammond of the University of Arizona, of the early history of New Mexico, from materials recently obtained from the Archivo General de Indias in Seville. It is entitled Don Juan de Oñate and the Founding of New Mexico.

The January number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* contains, besides a number of short articles of local interest and a continuation of the Diary of Wilkes in the Northwest, some additional notes on the Constitution of 1878, by J. Orin Oliphant.

The greater part of the December number of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* is occupied with an account of Oregon Geographic Names (A to C), by Lewis A. McArthur. There is also a first installment of a study by Charles H. Carey, the Creation of Oregon as a State.

The contents of the *Annual Publications* of the Historical Society of Southern California (1924) include a History of the California State Division Controversy, by Rockwell D. Hunt; Southern California in Civil War Days, by Percival J. Cooney; the Diary of Miss Harriet Bunyard, recording a journey from Texas to California in 1868; an account of early communication in California, by Helen L. Moore; and some biographical materials respecting Col. J. J. Warner, first president of the society, by Lillian A. Williamson.

The diary and letters of Frank Lecouvreur, who came to California from East Prussia in 1852, have been presented to the Southwest Museum, Los Angeles, by Professor Julius C. Behnke. Professor Behnke had prepared a translation of these materials, and this translation he also presented to the museum. Lecouvreur's letters cover the period from 1851 (the time he left Prussia) to 1868; the diary, which is of practically the same period, is said to include descriptions of great interest.

#### CANADA

The *Canadian Historical Review* has in the December number a valuable article by Judge F. W. Howay on Indian Attacks upon Maritime Traders of the North-West Coast, 1785-1805, and some correspondence between Joseph Howe and Charles Buller, 1845-1848, relating to the final achievement of responsible government in Nova Scotia. The correspondence is edited, with an introduction, by Professor Chester Martin of the University of Manitoba. To the section of Notes and Documents Mr. James White contributes an interesting commentary on a statement of the late Senator Lodge (Massachusetts Historical Society's *Proceedings*, April, 1925) respecting the Alaska Boundary Award.

The newly formed Société d'Histoire du Canada, whose organization we have chronicled in an earlier issue, established last summer its special organ, *Nova Francia*, of which the first number contains an account of the activities at Quebec and in Acadia of the missionaries of the Sémi-

naire du Saint-Esprit, by Father Albert David, and new documents on Salaberry and Maisonneuve.

Professor D. C. Harvey of the University of Manitoba relates the tragic story of the French occupation of the Isle St. Jean in a volume on *The French Régime in Prince Edward Island* (Yale University Press).

Volume XXII. of the *Papers and Records* of the Ontario Historical Society contains in all twenty-one papers, long and short, upon the whole an excellent group of studies, of which six are from the pen of Judge William R. Riddell, three from that of Brig.-Gen. E. A. Cruikshank, and two by Fred Landon. The principal articles by Judge Riddell are: the Legislature of Upper Canada and Contempt; Criminal Courts and Law in Early (Upper) Canada; the "Ordinary" Court of Chancery in Upper Canada; and Pierre du Calvet, a Huguenot Refugee in Early Montreal, His Treason and Fate. Those of General Cruikshank are: a Memoir of Lt.-Col. John Macdonell of Glengarry House, the First Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Upper Canada; and the Inception of the Welland Canal (1824). Mr. Landon's principal paper is on Social Conditions among the Negroes in Upper Canada before 1865, to which he adds an account of Anthony Burns in Canada, the story of a runaway slave. Of the other papers four are biographical sketches: of John Galt and John DeCou, pioneers, of Commodore Alexander Grant, and of Rev. Dr. John Ogilvie.

#### AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

Professor William S. Robertson's *History of the Latin-American Nations*, first published in 1922, now comes out in a revised edition (Appleton, pp. xxi, 630), a page of matter respecting the last three years in Mexico having been added and lesser amounts in the case of other countries. The author has also added an appendix of tables showing tendencies in the commercial relations of the Latin-American nations with other states.

No. 16 of that interesting series, *Archivo Histórico Diplomático Mexicano*, a volume edited by Professor Genaro Estrada, entitled *Diario de un Escribiente de Legación* (pp. xx, 286), is the journal of Joaquin Moreno, secretary of legation to Lorenzo de Zavala when the latter (afterward vice-president of the Republic of Texas) was envoy of Mexico to France in 1834 and chargé des affaires accredited to the Holy See. The journal, of which the manuscript was rescued from a market-stall, presents entertaining and sometimes acute observations of a young Mexican in New York, the Paris of Louis Philippe, and the Rome of Gregory XVI. No. 17, edited by Jesús and Raz Guzman, under the title *Las Relaciones Diplomáticas de México con Sud-América* (pp. xvi, 185), presents first, in an abridged form, a series of chapters on the diplomatic relations of Mexico with each of the South American republics, written in 1878 by Señor Angel Núñez Ortega, and then adds a hundred or so

pages of illustrative documents, chiefly of the early period and that of the Panama Congress, but in a few cases coming down as late as the time of the Panama revolution of 1903.

Those interested in Zavala should also know of a small book by Señor Alfonso Toro, *Dos Constituyentes del Año de 1824* (Mexico, 1925, pp. iv, 121), comprising biographies of Miguel Ramos Arispe and of Zavala.

The *Journal des Américanistes de Paris* has in its seventeenth volume, along with many articles of American archaeology and ethnology, a paper by M. Robert Ricard of Paris on "La Politique des Alliances dans la Conquête du Mexique par Cortés", and one by Senhor Argeu Guimarães, Brazilian chargé des affaires at Bogotá, on "Os Portuguezes na Conquista do Novo Reino de Granada".

Father Mariano Cuevas has discovered, in the National Archives of Mexico, five hitherto unknown letters of Hernán Cortés, his will, and a letter in cipher (*Razón y Fe*, LXII. 264).

Under the title *Labor Internacional de la Revolución Constitucionalista de México*, the government of that country has put forth a "Red Book" of some 345 documents (pp. 517) illustrative of the diplomacy of the Carranza government from 1913 to 1918, including the cases causing friction with the United States in 1914, the attempted "A. B. C." mediation, the withdrawal of the United States from Vera Cruz, the long negotiations over the Columbus, N. M., affair, and Mexico's pronouncements of neutrality in the World War.

Under the somewhat vague title, *Cuestiones Diversas* (Mexico, Imprenta Nacional, pp. 414), Señor Alberto J. Pani, formerly Mexican minister in Paris, prints 44 despatches addressed by him in that capacity to President Carranza between the beginning of his legation in February, 1919, and the downfall of Carranza in May, 1920. Some documents are annexed to the despatches, in one case 70 pages of Spanish translation of a debate on foreign policy in the French Chamber of Deputies.

In 1857 Dr. C. Schertzer published at Vienna *Las Historias del Origen de los Indios de esta Provincia de Guatemala*, by Father Francisco Ximénez, O.P., of which the manuscript had been discovered in the library of the University of Guatemala, marked as translated from Quiché into Spanish. Of this treatise, of great value for the aboriginal history and antiquities of Central America, the Biblioteca Nacional of San Salvador has published this year a reprint (pp. xvi, 137).

The four hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the city of San Salvador was commemorated last year by the foundation of the Academia de Historia Salvadoreña. Professor Jorge Lardé, in a scholarly pamphlet, *Orígenes de San Salvador Cuzcatlán, hoy Capital de El Salvador*, elaborately proves the date of the city's foundation to lie between February 24 and May 6, 1525.

The Hispanic Society of America announces that it has in the press a volume by Professor Bernard Moses, of the University of California, on *The Intellectual Background of the Revolution in South America, 1810-1824*.

The Institute of Ceará, in northeastern Brazil, commemorated in 1924 the centenary of the beginning of newspaper publication in its capital and the adhesion of the province to the revolutionary *Confederação do Equador*, formed in Pernambuco and adjoining provinces by revolt against Dom Pedro I. A special volume of the *Revista do Instituto do Ceará* (pp. 694) contains a full history of journalism in the province, by Baron de Studart, with facsimiles, and a history of the republican movement of 1824-1825 in Ceará, with many documents, by that author and others.

---

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. U. Faulkner, *Perverted American History* (Harper's Magazine, February); Émile Laloy, *Une Carte de Christophe Colomb* (Mercure de France, January 1); H. A. Smith, *Church and State in North America* (Yale Law Journal, February); Adolf Hasenclever, *Die Filibustier Westindiens im 17. Jahrhundert* (Preussische Jahrbücher, January); Bell M. Draper, *The Declaration of Independence* (Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine, January, February, March); F. D. Smith, *Holland's Contribution to the American Constitution* (Constitutional Review, January); F. L. Nussbaum, *American Tobacco and French Politics* (Political Science Quarterly, December); D. O. Wagner, *Some Antecedents of the American Doctrine of Judicial Review* (*ibid.*); E. C. MacVeagh, *The Other Rejected Amendments* (North American Review, December, January, February); J. B. Kingsbury, *Unicameral Legislatures in Early American States* (Washington University Studies, Humanistic Ser., October); A. J. Lien, *The Acquisition of Citizenship by the Native American Indians* (*ibid.*); R. W. Neeser, *Historic Ships of the Navy* [the *Bon Homme Richard*, the *Providence*, the *Randolph*] (United States Naval Institute Proceedings, January); W. E. Dodd, *The Making of Andrew Jackson* (Century Magazine, March); E. M. Coulter, *The Genesis of Henry Clay's American System* (South Atlantic Quarterly, January); H. A. Wooster, *A Forgotten Factor in American Industrial History* [the New England village general store] (American Economic Review, March); Raymond Turner, *Repudiation of Debts by States of the Union* [with replies by the governors of Georgia, North Carolina, Arkansas, and Virginia] (Current History, January); J. C. Parish, *The Persistence of the Westward Movement* (Yale Review, April); Sir Frederick Maurice, *Lincoln as a Strategist* (Forum, February); Curtis Nettels, *Andrew Johnson and the South* (South Atlantic Quarterly, January); Charles Warren, *The New "Liberty" under the Fourteenth Amendment* (Harvard Law Review, February); Alfred Vagts, *Der Krieg, Ursachen und*



*Anlässe, Ziele und Folgen*, II. *Der Spanisch-Amerikanische Krieg* (Europäische Gespräche, December); D. F. Houston, *Eight Years with Wilson* (World's Work, February, March); Capt. D. W. Knox, U. S. N., *An Adventure in Diplomacy* [an incident in Cuban waters in 1917] (United States Naval Institute Proceedings, February); M. de Pradel de Lamaze, *Lettres Louisianaises du Chevalier de Pradel* (Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques, Bulletin de la Section de Géographie, XXXIX.); J. H. Nelson, *Charles Gayarré: Historian and Romancer* (Sewanee Review, October–December); C. H. Haring, *El Origen del Gobierno Real en las Indias Españolas* (Boletín del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Buenos Aires, no. 24); Jesús Galindo y Villa, *Don Joaquín García Icazbalceta: su Vida y sus Obras* [with bibliography] (El Libro y el Pueblo, July–September, 1925); C. E. Chapman, *The Cuban Constitution and Congress* (California Law Review, November).

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

Colonel John W. Wright, U. S. A., is in command of the Fifth Infantry, stationed at Fort Williams, Portland, Maine. Till lately he was for several years attached to the Historical Section of the General Staff.

Mr. Richard B. Morris is an instructor in history in the College of the City of New York.

Dr. Frank A. Golder is a professor of modern European history in Leland Stanford University, and the author of the Carnegie Institution's *Guide to Materials for American History in Russian Archives*.